Vol. X. FEBRUARY, 1895. No 2.

The National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches accepts the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man.

Jan96*
Eliot Rev T L

THE UNITARIAN

A MAGAZINE OF LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY.

CONTENTS.

How God becomes the Father 49
Rev. T. Thompson
The Keys of Saint Peter *C. W. Wendte* 53
A Petition . . . *Rebecca Palfrey Utter* 57
Human Progress . . *James M. Whiton* 57
Nature's Teachings . . *Maud L. Cotton* 61
The Knowable: An Outline Criticism of Herbert Spencer's Philosophy . . . 62
Frederic W. Sanders
Inspiration . . . . *S. Fletcher Williams* 67
Patience . . . . . *Susan Coolidge* 71
Gibraltar and Tangiers *Marie C. Remick* 71
A Unitarian Apostle in the Khasi Hills, India . . . . . *Hajom Kissor Singh* 74
One of our Churches 77
Correspondence 77
One Upward Look Each Day 78
Editorial 79

Departments:
American Unitarian Association . . 83
George Batchelor
Sunday-schools . . *Edward A. Horton* 84
National Alliance of Unitarian Women 85
Emily A. Fifield
Guilds . . . . . *B. R. Bulkeley* 87
Temperance Work . . . *C. R. Eliot* 88
Literary Notes 88
Who's going to Church? 96
Samuel B. Stewart

NEWS FROM THE FIELD.

Augusta, Me., 90; Aurora, Ill., 90; Berkeley, Cal., 91; Boston, Mass., 91; Chelsea, Mass., 92; Chicago, Ill., 92; Cincinnati, Ohio, 92; Concord, N.H., 92; Coosada, Ala., 93; Ellsworth, Me., 93; Exeter, N.H., 93; Greenfield, Mass., 93; Hopedale and Mendon, Mass., 93; Lancaster, N.H., 93; Lawrence, Mass., 93; Leicester, Mass., 94; Lowell, Mass., 94; Madison, Wis., 94; Manchester, N.H., 94; McMillin, Wash., 94; Meadville, Pa., 94; Middleboro, Mass., 94; Philadelphia, Pa., 95; Pittsfield, Mass., 95; Saco, Me., 95; Salem, Mass., 95; Salt Lake City, Utah, 95; Spokane, Wash., 95; Sturgis, Mich., 95; Valparaiso, Ind., 95; Waterville, Me., 95; Wollaston, Mass., 96.

GEO. H. ELLIS, Publisher, 141 Franklin St., Boston, Mass.

Agents for England: H. RAWSON & CO., 16 New Brown St., Manchester.

[*Entered at the Post-office at Boston, Mass., as second-class mail matter.*]

One Dollar per Year. Single Copy, 10 Cents.

THE UNITARIAN.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT: Articles for publication, books intended for review, and all literary communications should be addressed to the Editor, **141 Franklin Street, Boston.**

BUSINESS DEPARTMENT: Subscriptions and all business communications should be sent to **Geo. H. Ellis, 141 Franklin Street, Boston,** to whom all drafts and money or express orders should be made payable.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION: To subscribers in the United States and Canada, One Dollar a year in advance, postage free. To foreign subscribers, $1.25 in American money, or 5 shillings in English money.

A PACKAGE of TEN COPIES, to one address, to be used for **missionary purposes,** will be sent for **$5.00.**

SAMPLE COPIES of THE UNITARIAN will be sent free on application.

THE UNITARIAN *will continue to be sent to subscribers until a request is received to discontinue, and until all arrearages are paid.*

PROSPECT HILL SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES, GREENFIELD, MASS. This is a Family School of about 30 pupils, on a beautiful estate of 6 acres, in a very healthful location. The dwelling-house has been recently enlarged and fitted with steam throughout, and new and complete drainage. Building provided with Laboratory, Studio, and Music Room. Regular course of 4 years includes English, Classical and Modern Languages, Science, Philosophy, Art, Vocal and Instrumental Music. Advanced Course for Graduates of High Schools. Prepares for any College.
JAMES C. PARSONS, Principal.

POWDER POINT SCHOOL, DUXBURY, MASS. Prepares Boys for Scientific School, College, or Business. Combines individual teaching with exceptional advantages for home and outdoor life. Laboratories. 50 Boys. F. B. KNAPP, S.B., Principal.

PROCTOR ACADEMY, ANDOVER, N.H. For both sexes. Healthful location. Liberal management. Expenses low. Prepares for college, or for teaching, etc. For catalogue, address
JAMES F. MORTON, A.M., Principal.

MR. KNAPP'S HOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS, PLYMOUTH, MASS. 12 boys, 26th year, H. W. Royal (Harvard), Head Master; Mrs. Knapp, Principal.

FREE READING! Unitarian tracts and other liberal religious literature sent free on application to Miss ELLEN A. CALL, 35 Summer Street, Lawrence, Mass.

Theodore Parker to a Young Man.

This letter from Theodore Parker, to a young man just starting out in life, was first printed in the *Christian Register* in 1885, and afterwards in leaflet-form. It has been some time out of print, and yet, from its straightforward, manly tone in relation to life, duty, wealth, study, religion, is still called for as a very available tract to be handed to boys and youth. It is now entered permanently in the *Register Tract Series*, and may be had at any time.

Single copy, 2 cts.; per hundred, 50 cts.

Address **Christian Register Association,** 141 Franklin Street, Boston.

A COLLEGE TOWN PULPIT.

MR. SUNDERLAND'S MONTHLY SERMONS.

50 Cents a Year. 5 Cents a Number. Reduced rates in quantities.

Series for 1894-95.

1. **The Soul's Cry for God.**
2. **Jesus as Humanity's Ideal.**
3. **Sectarianism: Its Evils, Causes, and Cures.**
4. **The True Cross of Christ.**
5. **Was Jesus God? How he came to be worshipped.**

Order from Rev. J. T. SUNDERLAND, Ann Arbor, Mich.

The Duties of Women. A Course of Lectures. By FRANCES POWER COBBE. 193 pages. Cloth, $1.00.
"The profoundest, wisest, purest, noblest book in principle, aim, and tone yet written upon the *true position of woman in society.*"

ONE UPWARD LOOK EACH DAY.

Poems of Faith and Hope.

SELECTED BY J. T. SUNDERLAND.

A collection of 89 poems in a handsome little volume, bound in Morocco and Cloth.

A Boston minister writes: "*Your 'Upward Look' book is beautiful. We are buying it by the dozen, and giving it where it will do good.*"

One of our best known authors writes us, "*It is surprising that so many excellent poems can be comprised in so small a compass, and offered at so small a price.*"

Price: Morocco, 75 cents each; Cloth, 50 cents each. Same edition, bound in Morocco, and containing *a neat Marriage Certificate* at the back, price 75 cents, net.

Send orders to J. T. SUNDERLAND, Ann Arbor, Mich., or to the A. U. A. Rooms, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

THE UNITARIAN

A Monthly Magazine of Liberal Christianity.

VOL. X. FEBRUARY, 1895. No. 2.

HOW GOD BECOMES THE FATHER.

A SERMON BY REV. T. THOMPSON OF THE FIRST CHURCH, NORWELL, MASS.

A visitor among the poor of New York City found a woman making double-stitched seamed overalls at four cents a pair. With the help of a four years' old child, who sewed on the buttons, by working fourteen hours a day, seven days in the week, she earned $3.75. The visitor spoke to her of God.

"God!" said the sewing-woman scornfully. "Why do you preach to me of God? There is no God for the poor,—no heaven. There is no hell except this life. No devil except the men who grind the lives of women and children into dollars and cents."

It is not of this woman's temporal condition, what caused it, or how to relieve it, that I wish to speak in this discourse. She could not believe in God, and there are many with less reason or no reason who are passionately or passively atheistic. These, seeing no ways through which God is revealing himself, do not know how to make such ways. Either they do not care to know God, or they think he should reveal himself in ways that they would prescribe. As he does not, he does not exist for them. It is such a spiritual condition that I have in view in this discourse.

It is not surprising that the sewing-woman did not believe in God, and she must not be blamed. She could not believe in or be helped by a God whom she could not see or hear, who did not have a personality as distinct as that of her visitor or employer. She had been told all her life that God was love. But no one seemed to love her. She had been told that he was a Father to the widow and the orphan. But he had not heard her cry. In the only way she knew *how* to know him, he had not been revealed to her. In the only way that she felt the need of help, he had not come to her aid. Very naturally, she did not believe in him.

If we are to believe in God as a Father, we must be able to see that he cares for us as a Father should, we must be able to see that he has done something for us, and will continue to do. If I had never done anything for my children, they might be compelled to call me father; but they would not *feel* that I was their father. Fatherhood is not a matter of words, but of feelings. There was nothing in that woman's circumstances to quicken the feeling of gratitude and reverence which should be felt for a father. Now, if, when she carried in her work, her employer had said, "I am going to pay you twenty cents a pair for overalls hereafter"; if her visitor had said: "I am going to take your child to ride every pleasant day: I have brought books and pictures for your enjoyment, and shall bring my friends, and want you to come to my house,"—if employer and visitor had greeted her in this way, very likely she would have experienced a great revulsion of feeling. Now she would experience the emotion of gratitude; and soon the hatred of her employer, which doubtless extended to all prosperous people, would give place to admiration and respect. She would now be in a proper frame of mind to hear about God, though she might still say, but without bitterness, that she did not believe in him. But she would be even more mistaken now than in her first passionately scornful declaration, yet still, from her point of view, consistent; for truly there is no God for any one in any helpful sense until he has become "our Father."

If this poor woman could have found the patience to listen, an argument might have been addressed to her that she could hardly

have answered. She could have been shown that there is a power outside of man mightier than the mightiest of earth. She lived under the shadow of the great Brooklyn bridge; and it would have been easy to show her that the strength of the material in the structure, and the electricity used in connection with it, were manifestations of that power. She might even have been forced to admit that it was more likely than not that there was an intelligence back of these manifestations, and she might have assented that the name God should be given to this intelligence. But it would still have been logically possible for her to say, "This being does not care for me: why should I care for him?"

And then the other party to the discussion, a minister, let us suppose, might go on to show that light and heat and many other enjoyable things are from God. But, having been taught to expect God to act directly, as her visitor might hand her a tract, he would seem no nearer and no more fatherly than before. Better fortune would not necessarily beget faith: her atheism might simply be passive where before it had been passionate. People fortunately placed are not always notably devout.

To make this woman and those like-minded believe in God, you would have to convince them that God *is*. To make them care for God, you would have to show that he cared for them. God, whom they acknowledged with the intellect, would have to be recognized as a helper before they would feel that he was their father.

God *is*. But *God* is not the Father. He *becomes* the Father. He is not our Father in the best and completest sense until we acknowledge him to be our Father. We must know him as our Father before we can love him and realize that he loves us.

As long as that woman was starved and cold and worked like a slave, it mattered little to her that there was a God. She could not see that he was a helper of the poor and needy. It was only a *helper* who could change her resentful spirit to that spirit, reverent and grateful, which prompts the lips to shape those divinest words, "Our Father." Whoever would make this change in any one must be able to say in deeds, if not in words, "I am God." People cannot be made to believe in a God who does not give them the kind of help they need. In no way could the help that woman craved come to her except through men. Therefore, she could only know God through man. It is only through man that God can reveal himself as a Father. Man makes man to believe in God or keeps him from believing. To make people believe in God, you must make them believe in you.

It is of no use to teach that goodness, mercy, truth, and love are throned on high. What evidence can you proffer that such is the case? Say that God gives the sunshine, and some one retorts, "There are days when we *have* no sunshine, and suffer for want of it." Does he withhold also when he might give?

Say he gives the refreshing breeze, and one says, "The gentle breeze becomes a whirlwind, and destruction marks its passage." You cannot make the elements fatherly. You cannot install goodness, mercy, truth, and love on high, and expect men to see them *there*. God must not only be God to the theologian and the philosopher who can reason, but he must be God also to the sewing-woman who can only feel.

"Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us," was the demand of the disciples. But neither from sense of need nor from curiosity are people asking the same question to-day. We who believe in God to-day must not wait to be *asked* to show God: we must compel men to see and acknowledge him in us. The goodness, mercy, love, all the fatherly qualities that we would have men believe are in God, must be in us, else the Father can have no existence for those who doubt and repine or who are indifferent and unbelieving.

The best revelation of him is not that which is read in the beauty and order of the universe,—that is good for certain calm, high moods: the best revelation is that which is disclosed by a pure, wise, earnest soul. We cannot see the goodness and mercy that are the goodness and mercy of intent anywhere so well as in a human soul. It is the soul of man that best reveals God, and *only* the soul of man that can show forth the Father. It was by his soul that Jesus revealed the Father. He told men that God, the same God who made the world, who was might in the storm and

sweetness in the rose, order among the stars and music in the throat of the bird, was love, mercy, truth, in the soul of man. Look where you will, and God the creator may be found; but God the Father can only be found in one anointed by the Holy Spirit.

"He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," said Jesus. Which is to say that the personality of God not discoverable in nature must be looked for in the soul of man. The pure in heart shall see God. In no irreverent sense, God is dependent upon man for the opportunity to show himself forth as the Father. Man may be God's opportunity.

There are those who affirm that the spirits of the departed return to earth, and manifest themselves through the organism of a living body. I do not know whether this is so or not,—never any so came to me,—but all the spirits I ever knew were resident in a body; and love, mercy, sympathy, justice, truth,—the manifestations by which I know that a spirit is helpfully present,—are always associated with a body. I was never conscious of them in association with a mist or a shower, a heat ray or a light ray. The spirit is invisible; and I only know that there *is* an invisible spirit, as I know first that there is a visible body. The spirit needs a body to give it visibility. God is a Spirit. How shall he become visible? He must become visible in men: there is no other way. Spirit is force, and, like other modes of force, must reveal its presence through a coarser medium. Pure steam cannot be seen till it is mixed with something coarser. The electric current must flash in flame for us to be able to say we see it. Pure spirit is likewise invisible. God cannot reveal himself without a medium. The purest can only reveal himself as a Father through the less pure. We are the medium, though not pure, through which, nevertheless, the heavenly Father comes to bless his children. There *is* no heavenly Father for those who need his help and love unless he is in us. Imperfect, sinful, as we are, we must embody the spirit of God, that the Father may be visibly present to the senses and understanding of men; that love, mercy, justice, truth, shall have personality; that the highest form that force can assume may reveal the fatherhood of God. Force in nature, acting through inanimate things, can only manifest itself as motion, moving without regard for the good or ill of man.

Force conscious in the soul of man can move to help, cheer, and bless.

Do we understand this,—understand that the power to give purpose to the intellectual, moral, and physical force resident in us is the power to reveal God as the Father? Partially, it is to be hoped, many do. But one man believed he understood it so fully that he believed and taught that the Father was in him. Therefore, he declared, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." People all about him, good and bad, rich and poor, were in need of love and sympathy, just as we are in need of them to-day. Not some *thing*, but some *one*, must supply such need, or they must forever lack. Love could not come on the wings of the wind or in heat and flame, but only through the words and deeds of men. And it is only so to-day that the divine attributes, love, mercy, justice, can come into the affairs of men. Jesus is not here to-day that men may see the divine attributes in him, and so they must see them in us. We must be, in Jesus' stead, the manifestation of the Father.

Men were told that God was a great and awful being; and they believed it once, and fear made him seem close at hand. Then, transgressing his supposed commands and nothing happening to them, he at last became unreal. In these days God is less awful, but not less unreal, to many. Instead of, as once, arbitrary will, he is Perfect Goodness; and, as Perfect Goodness, for many he is unmeaning. For perfect goodness is considered rather unpractical, if a man is to get on in the world. We have got used to moral imperfection, and either do not realize our condition or are not greatly disturbed by it. We do not see as we ought that we should be the manifestation of the Father.

Do we—nay, can we—care how little the woman is paid for the articles we eagerly buy at what we know is less than cost? The manufacturer knows that we will buy where we can buy the cheapest, and that, if he pays a fair price, another will undersell him. Doubtless the woman who made those overalls would have rejoiced to hear that her employer had lost half his profit, if indeed

he made any, provided he did not cut her down another cent.

We are all undeveloped, imperfect, bad together. We must admit that we do not deserve to see God, are not fit to see him; and perhaps our denial of him by word or conduct is really but the admission of our unfitness and undeserving. And so God becomes a theory, something to argue about, or, tiring of argument, a matter of indifference. What is revealed to the senses is all that seems real. We must see, touch, taste, a thing in order to believe in it. The forces acting through matter we acknowledge, they are more powerful than we; but a Father, a universal Father, is a conception so vague that, to be fully persuaded that he is, with the disciples, we must see him. "Show us the Father, and then we know that he is."

And all the time has he not been with us, and we have not seen him? Alas for the man who must have everything proved to his senses, who cannot know unless he can see and touch!

"Have I been so long time with you, and hast thou not known me?" Jesus asks mournfully.

What makes a father? Is it not a strong, sweet, tender spirit? Can there be a father without it? Without it man is but a begetter of his kind, like other animals. With it he is a father, whether any call him by that holy name or not.

And here in the midst of the questioning, doubting disciples was one with the strong, sweet, tender spirit; and they knew not that the Father was with them, but were looking beyond him for a visible form.

Why, if God were to appear in the most majestic form conceivable, in order to show that he was a father, he would have to put off all his majesty, that we might know him as such.

The president of the Divinity School was a man of great dignity and culture. I stood in awe of him at first. I saw him every day, but seeing is not knowing. I might not have known him for a long time but for a little incident. I was at his house one day. While we were talking, his wife brought in the little grandchild. And forthwith the baby climbed upon his knees, and pulled his hair, and thrust its fingers in his eyes, and behaved in a manner that would have been scandalous if I had done so. But the baby did not see or know the doctor of divinity I was looking at. It knew its grandpa, knew that in him there was gentleness, sweetness, patience, love. It never *could* have known him if it had looked at the scholar and divine. After this, the real introduction, the baby and I *both* knew him.

To know God, you must not look to see the Almighty, but to see the Father. God has not any way to show his fatherhood but the way we have to show it. Being without form recognizable by the senses, his spirit must tenant in us. He that sees a true man or woman should in either see the Father.

"If ye had known me," Jesus says, "ye would have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him," which being interpreted, if it needs interpreting, is, "I have given myself so completely to the service of good that I am become a transparent medium through which the invisible spirit of God becomes visibly manifest as the Father."

Yet, though a medium, he was not an instrument. He was never more himself than when God was speaking and acting through him, and he was thus revealing the Father. I go back to the home of my boyhood, youth, and early young manhood. I am at a little gathering of neighbors and friends. An aged man, a contemporary of my father, is present. He does not know me. Some one tells him who I am.

"Oh, yes," he says, as he takes my hand, and scans my face with age-dimmed eyes, "you look like your father."

But the likeness is not so remarkable: he would never have noted it if he had not been told who I was. But, as the conversation becomes general, I laugh, tell a story, move about, or sit at ease, and involuntarily the old man exclaims: —

"You laughed just like your father then. You told that story in just his way. When you stood here or sat over yonder, your attitude was his. That is the motion of his hand, the flash of his eye, the very sound of his voice."

And yet all the time I am myself, and yet all the time, to the old man, the reminder of another to whom his thoughts are carried up and back until it is as

though one were there who was when I was not. But I note that it is not until he knows me, who I am, that he sees any resemblance to one whom he has known. But, when he knows me, that other is more real than I.

Jesus was never more himself than when he said, "I and my Father are one: he that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

"If ye had known me," he says, "ye would have known my Father also." If they had known him! If they had only seen the love and purity that were in him, they would have been filled with a new kind of doubt, and would have said to each other, "Could God show these forth more fully?" And then their souls would have answered, and said, "Lo! here *is* God."

God the all-wise, God the everywhere present, we cannot see, in his omnipotence and omnipresence; but, when the spirit of a man reflects and reveals God, we may always see the Father. When we see love, kindness, patience, helpfulness, in the soul of a man or woman, when we see the soul of a man or woman in them, we need look no further. God is there. Nowhere else shall you so clearly read the revelation of his fatherhood.

Do not misunderstand me: I am not saying that there is no God outside of man. God was before man, was the maker of man. Having made man, he made ways to reveal many of his attributes; and through these ways man can know him in his power, majesty, and wondrous skill. But he left himself no way to reveal his fatherhood. He made man to be the keeper of that way. What was impossible with God was made possible to man: the lesser was made the revelator of the greater.

So, to know God as a Father, we must know man. We do not know man until we know him at his best, which is to know the Christ, the spirit of sonship that has been ever in the world. This spirit is seen most easily, and by most people, in Jesus; and so we should know Jesus. To know him is to know the Father. He bodied the spirit of God. To be like him is to ourselves embody that spirit, so that we are one with God even as he was one, even as have been all who have displayed the highest of which man is capable.

I have no word of condemnation for that poor sewing-woman. I have nothing but pity. No woman should be brought to such a pass: it ought not to be possible, whatever one's fault. But that woman was wrong. There is a God, a heaven, for the poor; and such as she have often demonstrated this better than those endowed with wisdom and knowledge.

Would you know how?

If she had worked sixteen, eighteen, twenty, hours a day to support her child, if her fingers had frozen to the needle, if she had starved to death, her work well done while her strength lasted, not for fear of losing it, but that she might be faithful unto death,—if all this had happened, and I had been called to speak of her, I would have said:—

"Lo! God is here, was in this woman, though she knew it not. Uncover, kneel, you will never get nearer to God than this. If now you know this woman, what she was and what spirit was in her, you know how the mighty God becomes a Father: it is by begetting such children as this.

"Show us the Father: let us see him with our eyes, and it will be enough, do you say?"

Oh, no: it is not what we see with our eyes that is enough, but what we feel in our hearts, what we are in our souls. Hath he been so long time with us, and yet have we not known him?

THE KEYS OF SAINT PETER;

OR, A LIBERAL PROTESTANT VIEW OF THE CLAIMS OF THE PAPACY.

II.

In a preceding article I inquired whether the Roman Catholic doctrine of the primacy of Saint Peter, and through him of Rome, finds support in Scripture. In the present article I wish to ask if it finds support in history or reason.

The Protestant Reformation not only freed men's minds by informing them what was the actual gospel of Jesus, it also, with the aid of critical science, gave them a new and truer reading of history; and thus it destroyed the second great authority for Peter's primacy and the divine right of the Roman Church—namely, the tradition of Peter's long sojourn, his bishopric, and final martyrdom in the Eternal City.

The Catholic Church has always claimed that it is abundantly and surely attested by traditions, documents, and monuments that Peter, after a stay of ten years as Bishop of Antioch, departed for Rome, where, after reigning for twenty-five years, two months, and three days as bishop, he set the seal on his glorious career by suffering at the same time with Paul a martyr's death during the persecution under Nero, in the year 68 A.D.

The Protestant Reformation declared the story of Peter's stay and bishopric in Rome to be an error and a fiction. Modern Protestant science, in the persons of thoroughly equipped and critical scholars,* has established this quite conclusively, and forever destroyed the so-called historical foundation for Peter's primacy at Rome. The arguments and proofs they adduce are, naturally, too long to be adduced in this discourse; yet at least an outline of their investigations and conclusions may be in place. It is claimed in the official declarations of the Roman Catholic Church (Liber Pontificalis etc.) that Peter resided in Rome twenty-five years and more, but that he had previously served for ten years as Bishop of Antioch.

If the latter statement be correct, Peter must have left Jerusalem for Antioch immediately after the crucifixion of Christ, and remained in Asia Minor ten years. But this is an impossibility, for we learn from the Book of Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians that Peter was in *Jerusalem* for many years after the crucifixion. Paul finds him there (Galatians i. 18) three years after his conversion; and he tells us (Galatians ii. 1–11) that it was not till fourteen years after this (3+14=17) that Peter went to Antioch, and then not as bishop, but on a missionary visit only.

Again, if Peter was for twenty-five years a bishop in Rome, and was put to death there in 68 A.D., he must have gone there as early as the year 43 of our era. But, turning to the New Testament, we find that Peter was in prison at Jerusalem in the year 44. In the year 50 Paul meets him in Jerusalem. In the year 58 Paul writes his great Epistle to the Romans. Now, it is strange that in all this Epistle there should not be a single allusion to Peter. The last chapter is made up principally of greetings to Paul's acquaintances in the Eternal City. Some twenty-six different persons are mentioned by name; but Peter, Paul's fellow-apostle, is not once referred to. Is not this inexplicable and inconceivable, if Peter was really in Rome at the time, and, as is claimed, was the founder and bishop of the Church there? Why, indeed, did Paul feel called upon at all to write his letter of counsel and admonition to the Romans, if they already had an apostolic and authoritative teacher like Peter abiding among them?

Two years after writing this Epistle, Paul comes himself to Rome (60 A.D.) to stay we know not how long. The Book of Acts closes with Paul's captivity there. But neither the Book of Acts nor Paul in the Epistles he wrote from Rome makes any allusion to Peter, which is inconceivable, if he was abiding there at the time and the acknowledged head of the Church. In the First Epistle of Peter v. 13, we find a salutation from "She [the Church] that is in Babylon." Roman Catholic theologians interpret Babylon in this passage to be a concealed reference to Rome. But this is merely an assumption. We know that Babylon was still a considerable city in Peter's day, and that the apostle's activity was displayed in that very region. But in any case it would not suffice to establish Peter's stay at Rome. Furthermore, modern critical science rejects this so-called Epistle of Peter as ungenuine, and palpably a later imitation of the Pauline letters.

Roman Catholic scholars, indeed, cite a long list of Church Fathers to prove the long residence and primacy of Peter in Rome. Read without historical and critical judgment, these make quite an imposing appearance. But Protestant critics easily show that the earliest of these supposed witnesses —such as Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Papias, Dionysius, etc.,—really give no information whatever on the subject; and it is only by the most forced and illegitimate constructions that they can be made to appear as testifying to Peter's presence in Rome.* It is not until the end of the second century,

*Among them Baur, Schenkel, Hase, Schwegler, Hausrath, Volkmer, and especially R. A. Lipsius's *Chronologie der roemischen Bischoefe*, Kiel, 1891.

*They are enumerated in order, and their supposed testimony invalidated, in E. Zeller's *Abhandlungen* (vol. ii., pp. 220-251), Hase's *Protestantische Polemik*, pp. 128–131, Lipsius, etc.

or more than a hundred years after the supposed martyrdom of Peter, that we come upon any historical testimony to his abode and death in Rome. At the end of the second century we find a general tradition existing in the Roman Church, and a general and increasing consent among the writers of that time, to the effect that Peter and Paul *both* preached the gospel in Rome, founded the Church there, and suffered martyrdom.

One writer even affirms that he knows his funeral "trophy" in the imperial gardens of Nero (now the Vatican), which seems a singular place for it. In the year 258 of our era the apostle's bones seem to have been discovered in a way that may satisfy blind faith, but does not approve itself to historical science. They were honored and worshipped as relics, and ultimately placed under the dome of St. Peter's Church at Rome. But this did not suffice the pious believers in the legend. Step by step it was expanded and enriched by new facts and fancies, which had their origin in the devout imagination and priestly interests of the Church. Chapels were erected to commemorate the legends about his stay in Rome, which now began to appear in plentiful variety. The precise spot is shown on the Janiculus, at the Church of San Pietro in Montorio, where he was crucified head downwards. The writer was permitted to gaze into the very hole in which the foot of his cross had rested; and particles of earth were brought up from it to show that ever since that fatal day the ground has assumed the hue and aspect of silver, — a consequence, probably, of mica dust thrown into it from time to time by its guardians. However, such pious deception is not exceptional to the Catholic Church. In very much the same way the Protestant keepers of the Wartburg were in the habit of renewing the ink-spot on the wall where Martin Luther hurled his inkstand at the devil.

The ancient and rock-hewn Mamertine Prison under the Capitol at Rome, in which Jugurtha and the Catilines were confined, is confidently pointed out as the place of the apostle's captivity, and is now called San Pietro in Carcere. The spring which bubbles out of it was, we are informed, called forth from the rock by Peter, in order to baptize the soldiers of the guard whom he had converted. The very chains which he bore may be seen in the Church of San Pietro de Vinculis. A single link of them was recently bestowed by Pope Leo XIII., as a mark of special favor, upon the Bishop of Burlington, Vt. Its reception in that city was signalized by imposing church ceremonies. Archbishops and bishops and minor clergy bore it about in solemn processional, while thousands of the laity knelt in adoration and thanksgiving to press their lips upon this assumed relic of the apostle.

Thus, step by step, we may trace the gradual development through the centuries of this official myth of the Roman Catholic Church, and learn to appreciate its essentially unhistorical character. It is not until a hundred years after the reported death of the apostle Peter that we come upon testimonies to the general tradition existing at Rome of his sojourn, primacy, and death there. Now, a hundred years is a long time. How many legends and myths have arisen in our own enlightened country during the past hundred years, and still persist! How much more must this not have been the case in the ignorant, uncritical, credulous, and turbulent age which witnessed the downfall of the Roman Empire and the transformation of the spiritual democracy of Jesus and his disciples into the monarchical constitution of the Roman hierarchy, especially when it was so manifestly for the interests of the clergy to spread the doctrine of Peter's Roman primacy!

We may then sum up the results of this review as follows: First, Peter was never invested by Jesus Christ with any extraordinary authority or spiritual supremacy above the other disciples. Second, even if he had been so invested, there is nothing to show that this authority was or could be transferred to succeeding generations of disciples. This transfer is purely an assumption on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, and without foundation in fact or reason. Third, Peter was never bishop in Rome. Indeed, the unanimous tradition of the Church Fathers designates one Linus as the first Roman bishop. Fourth, Peter never abode in Rome for any such term as is claimed for him in the official declarations of the Roman Catholic Church. This would have been a physical and chronological impossibility. Fifth, Peter was in all

probability never in Rome at all. He may have visited it for a brief stay after Paul's death, but there is no real evidence for it except the general tradition a hundred years later; while, as we have seen, there is considerable testimony of a negative character against the supposition.

Yet on this slender foundation has been built the enormous superstructure of papal pretension and power, which, after swaying the world for centuries, is now undermined and falling to pieces before our eyes. This is testified to by the forlorn condition of that Church to-day in England, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Mexico, South America, and other countries over which the papacy once exercised supreme authority. Surely, then, this decaying Roman Catholic Church cannot be the institution of which Jesus Christ said, "On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

There is much to admire in the personal piety and Christian virtues of many members of the Roman Catholic communion, both among its clergy and its laity. The theological system of Rome, considered apart from its ecclesiastical institutions, is to my mind quite as rational and more humane than that of Luther or Calvin. No word of depreciation against the religious fervor, benevolent activities, and private virtues of our Roman Catholic neighbors and fellow-Christians has ever been heard from this pulpit. I share in their admiration of such illustrious and holy men as Saint Francis Assisi, Saint Francis de Sales, Saint Vincent de Paul, and other saviors of their fellow-men, in whom the Roman Catholic Church is so rich. I rejoice in the gentle ministrations of the devout Sisters of Charity. It is solely the hierarchical pretensions which centre in the papacy against which I protest, both as a follower of Jesus Christ and an American citizen. These pretensions are advanced as boldly as ever, though the Church is visibly weakening in her hold on the imagination and loyalty of the Christian world. We have seen them carried to a speculative extreme in our day in the dogma of papal infallibility. This preposterous claim the Church never would have dared to advance at the height of her actual power in by-gone centuries, and would not dare to advance now, were it not that the general conviction of her impotence to enforce her doctrines, or carry them out practically in social and political life, makes modern rulers indifferent to her expressions of speculative opinion. But what grave consequences to free institutions these opinions might have, if the Church *could* put them into practice, we may see from one among many similar utterances of her priesthood. One of her most distinguished prelates, Monsignor Preston, declared in New York, "If any man will say, 'I will take my faith from Peter, but I will not take my politics from Peter,' he is not a true Catholic." No wonder that Father McGlynn, then under ban, denounced this proposition as opposed to the principles of our American nationality and of a free and spiritual religion.

Such a religion the Catholic faith would develop into if it were not for this hierarchical ambition, which at the present day, as in the past, is the chief hindrance to its own spiritual growth and always a menace to civil and religious liberty. The whole history of the papacy shows what a fatal error it is to concentrate absolute and irresponsible power in the hands of fallible and mortal men. It is the possession of this despotic, unlimited power which, in the annals of the popes of Rome, as in those of the czars of Russia, has led to indefensible abuses and frightful excesses, to the detriment of a true Christianity, the arrest of knowledge and free thought, and the corruption of public and private morals. The downfall of the papacy, therefore, which our age is witnessing, is to be earnestly desired, is to be abetted and rejoiced over.

I hold it to be the duty of every Protestant minister to expose, without acrimony or abuse, but with candor, courage, and courtesy, the fallacies and myths on which the hierarchy of Rome bases its claims to the civil and religious sovereignty of the world. And this not from any fear of Roman Catholic ascendency in this country. Statistics show conclusively that, while that Church can claim only one-eighth of our population, its increase in membership for the past few years, according to the returns in its own year-books, has fallen much behind the rate of increase of the population of the United States. Evidently, Roman Catholicism, with the falling off of Catholic emigration, has

reached its zenith in this country. Relatively speaking, it will continue to lose ground. And, meanwhile, our free political institutions, our free schools and churches, our free science and criticism and newspapers, are undermining its positions, discrediting its pretensions, and preparing the way for its transformation, or, possibly, its overthrow.

Nor is it to glorify the Protestant Church at the expense of the Catholic that this review has been undertaken. As Dr. Channing well said: "Most Protestant sects are built on the papal foundation. Their creeds and excommunications embody the grand idea of infallibility as truly as the decrees of Trent and the Vatican." It is for the sake of Christianity itself, for the welfare of the true catholic faith, that the downfall of both the temporal and the spiritual supremacy of Rome is to be desired and abetted. Let it be remembered that during the first century of the Christian Church, when its struggle was the severest, and the powers of earth were all arrayed against it, it had no bishop and no pope. Christianity was not planted or saved by Peter's primacy. The little, humble, scattered congregations maintained their ground, increased their numbers, and won their victory through the power of spiritual convictions and trusts. A spiritual principle, not a hierarchy, was the rock on which Christ founded his Church. The papacy first came into existence when the victory was assured, and worldly interests and personal ambitions usurped the place of the apostles' zeal and the martyrs' sacrifice. Even so to-day the Christian religion needs not spiritual potentates or a sacred order: it needs not infallible popes, or Scriptures, or synods, or creeds. These only stifle the religious sentiment in man. It needs a reborn and quickening faith,—a faith not in outworn traditions, baseless legends, and exploded mysteries, but in intellectual truths, ethical principles, and ideal trusts.

In the Gospel of Matthew (xviii. 18) we read that Jesus committed the power to bind and loose, to retain and remit sin, not only to Peter, but to *all* the disciples. "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever *ye* bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever *ye* loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Whatever weight of authority we may attach to this mysterious passage, one thing is assured: the keys of heaven are in the hands of no one privileged mediator between man and God. Every disciple is a priest of the Most High; every pure soul is God's temple; every honest thought, every virtuous action and holy prayer, brings us into immediate and intimate relations with our Father in heaven, promotes our present felicity, and opens the kingdom of heaven to all believers. CHARLES W. WENDTE.

A PETITION.

O heavenly Father, from his dwelling-place
Let some swift angel at thy bidding speed
To visit in her hour of direst need
One who through sorrow's cloud would see thy face!

Bid him around her aching heart enfold,
That it a moment from its pain may cease,
His strong white wings of restfulness and peace,
Which yet some healing airs from heaven may hold.

And bid him, covering with his hand her eyes,
Shut out the lonely path her feet must tread
On earth awhile, that she may see instead
Bright mansions of thy other house arise.

We, who would help her, at her side we stay
Silent, with longing heart and helpless hand.
Thou art her father. Thou wilt understand.
Send her the peace earth cannot take away.

REBECCA PALFREY UTTER.

Salt Lake City.

HUMAN PROGRESS.

THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL FACTORS.

Recent interest has been drawn to this subject by the strikingly original and widely read work of Mr. Benjamin Kidd on Social Evolution, a work remarkable at once for its merits and its defects. What is to be said on the subject of the present paper will not inappropriately be largely in review of Mr. Kidd's references to it.

Mr. Kidd notes at the outset that, notwithstanding the successful attack on religious dogmas by modern learning, there is, even among those who have revolted from the churches, an increasing religiousness in society that is "perhaps without a parallel in any previous age." But he regards contemporary science as failing to comprehend the grand "utilitarian function" which religion fulfills in the social evolution. Of

this he proceeds to give the following account.

The evolution of life proceeds among mankind, as among the lower tribes, by a method of selecting the strongest and healthiest. In order to this, more must be born than can live without a struggle to live. In this struggle the inefficient are weeded out, and those survive who are the fittest for the advance of life. Now, these conditions of progress are prejudicial to the welfare of a multitude of individuals who fall out by the way.

Man, however, is capable of reasoning about this. Reason insists that it is our duty to look out for ourselves first, now and here, rather than "to speculate about a problematical future for unborn generations." Accordingly, says Mr. Kidd, "If we ask what course it is the interest of the masses to pursue from the standpoint of reason, it seems hardly possible to escape the conclusion that they should in self-interest put an immediate end to existing social conditions." Not only does this hold good of unwholesome conditions in the actual present, but he goes on to say, "It is evident that *any* organization of society with a system of rewards according to natural ability can have no ultimate sanction in reason for all the individuals"; that is, for the weak or ungifted, who assert that, as they are not to blame for having been born what they are, they ought in equity of reason to share alike with the better born. He supplements this with a foot-note to this effect: in the rationalistic view the ultimate sanction for our conduct in society is no other than that which a rule of force provides by the will of a majority or a ruling class. It may occur here even to untrained thinkers that this ultimate reference of reason to force may arise from a pecular notion of what reason is.

At any rate, our author concludes that there is "no rational sanction for progress." He finds that all thinkers, from Thales to Spencer, have failed to discover in the nature of things a rational sanction for individual conduct. This can never be found, because the interests of the social organization and of the individual are, and must remain, antagonistic. This conclusion he states as "the transforming fact with which the scientific development of the nineteenth century has confronted us" at the close of that extended stage of thought in which for 2,300 years the human mind has prosecuted a necessarily fruitless search.

This is an impressive proclamation, and not the only surprise which greets us in this book with what the author regards as a "revolutionary significance." But, before going further, we may as well take breath here in looking to see what it is that is upset.

Mr. Kidd, in despair of reason, turns to religion as the sole source of the necessary sanctions of conduct. "The central feature of history," he says, "the meaning of which neither science nor philosophy has hitherto fully recognized, is apparently the struggle which man has carried on to effect the subordination of his own reason," as "a hostile force." Furthermore, "the motive power in this struggle has undoubtedly been supplied by his religious beliefs." But how is it that reason can appear to be a hostile force? Our author explains this later on in telling us what he means by reason. It is really nothing else than the "rational self-assertiveness" of the individual, his "enlightened selfishness."

"The self-assertiveness of the individual must be absolutely subordinated to the maintenance of a process in which the individual himself has not the slightest interest, but to the furtherance of which his personal welfare must be often sacrificed." Thus repeatedly: "Our progress is over and above everything else social progress. It is always tending to secure in an increasing degree the subordination of the present interests of the self-assertive individual to the future interests of society, his expanding intellect notwithstanding." Again we are told of "that enlightened selfishness in the individual which must always lead him to rank his own interests, or those of his immediate belongings in the actual present, before the wider and entirely different interests of the longer-lived social organism to which he belongs."

Nor does the author omit to show what this rational self-assertiveness and enlightened selfishness are intent on, which he thus introduces as synonymes of reason: "Every pain avoided, every pleasure gained in these few precious years [of conscious life], is a consideration beside which the

intellect must count any aspiration to further a process of cosmic evolution, in which the individual has no interest, as mere dust in the balance. We must expect wealth and power to be grasped at with a fierce earnestness, not for what are called sordid motives, but for intellectual motives, above all others; that is to say, for the command of the pleasures and gratifications which they alone can secure," or, as he adds, for "voluptuousness and epicureanism in all their most refined forms."

It is plain from this that what Mr. Kidd generally calls "reason," and sometimes "intellect," is what is known to ethical writers as hedonistic egoism, a self-asserting regard to selfish gratification. We accordingly receive with less astonishment his statement that "a rational religion is a scientific impossibility." Quite so, and a moral impossibility also. All well-disposed persons must then agree with him that the function of religion must be to provide a sanction for individual conduct of a super-rational sort. If one accepts his terminology, common sense declares him right in holding that the evolution of human society "is not primarily intellectual." For what he calls intellect, or more usually reason, being, as he explains it, merely an intelligent selfishness, is not so characteristically human as it is vulpine or aquiline.

"For the highest is the measure of the man,
and not the Kaffir."

The mark of reason, as the Stoics taught, is in conformableness to the nature of things. It is strange that any respectable thinker should baptize with the name of reason that element of the mind which asserts itself in contradiction to the nature of things, and would suspend, if it could, the orderly evolution of the living world. This, as one learns from the outlines of psychology, is not reason at all, but *desire*,—a desire, too, whose spring is in the lower stratum of human nature. If this were reason, then the nature of things which contradicts it would itself be irrational. Such is the dilemma into which Mr. Kidd's peculiar terminology brings him. Either that which he calls the "most anti-social and anti-evolutionary of all human qualities" is not reason, as he terms it, or the evolutionary course of nature itself is against reason.

The prolonged attention we have given to this point seems to have been required by the fact that Mr. Kidd lays such reiterated emphasis on the assertion that "there can never be any such thing as a rational religion." In this he will have the concurrence of a numerous chorus of professors of that opinion, and is likely to win the suffrages of many callow minds, who are prone to be fascinated by an original, adventurous, and dogmatic thinker. The more, therefore, one is bound to make it plain that what Mr. Kidd has upset is not the rationality of religion, but rather the accepted psychological vocabulary. He has surreptitiously transferred to mere egoistic desire, and that proceeding from our brute inheritance in the basement of our nature, the name and claim of that reason which, as he incongruously observes, men continually extol as their highest possession.

But it is more agreeable to record our gratitude to Mr. Kidd for his declaration that the evolution of human society is not primarily intellectual, but religious, in its character, although we cannot approve his argument for that proposition. His course of thought is as follows:—

"In what," he asks, "lies the significance of that deepening and softening of character which has long been in progress amongst the Western peoples?" We recognize here the true conception of human progress as progress in humanity, the development of our moral nature.

He answers that it could not, as commonly supposed, be the product of an increased intellectual enlightenment. No such force would have "successfully assailed the almost impregnable position of the power-holding classes." That position has been undermined and overthrown by the growth of an altruistic feeling peculiar to the Christian religion, and enforced by that religion with "extraordinarily effective sanctions." The religious movement known as Christianity "involved from its inception the very highest conception of the altruistic ideal to which the human mind has in any general sense ever attained." In the period of the post-Reformation development "it became the destiny of the religious system upon which our civilization is founded to release into the practical life of the world that product which constitutes the most powerful

motive influence ever enlisted in the cause of progress." The consequent strengthening and deepening of humanitarian feelings "has all the appearance of being one of the most vital processes in progress in our civilization." Furthermore, "in the eyes of the evolutionist, it is by contributing the factor which has rendered this unique process of social development possible that the Christian religion has tended to raise the peoples affected by it to the commanding place they have come to occupy in the world."

But how have these results in moral and social progress come to pass? Is it, as Mr. Kidd repeatedly avers, by virtue of "the extraordinarily effective sanctions" to which Christianity appeals? Or is another account of it which he quotes approvingly from Mr. W. S. Lilly the true account,—namely, that religion makes its way "by an appeal to those fundamental spiritual instincts to which it supremely corresponds"? Mr. Kidd repeatedly speaks of our instincts as potent in the evolutionary process. It is, he tells us, "a profound social instinct," which in the interest of social evolution continually checks the tendency of "reason" (*i.e.*, egoistic desire) to suspend the evolutionary process. It is "an extraordinary instinct," which drives successive generations into "desperate," "remorseless," "relentless struggle" against the forces of man's own mind. With this profound and extraordinary instinct at work, one looks to see how the peculiar sanctions of religion, appealing to divine enactments, get in the extraordinary effectiveness our author attributes to them. In a remarkable passage he gives the clew to the answer, which he does not seem to have thought out clearly. Quoting Mr. Spencer, that religious creeds "all embody the belief that right and wrong are right and wrong simply in virtue of divine enactment," he remarks: "This is so, but not apparently because of some meaningless instinct in man. It is so in virtue of a fundamental law of our social evolution. It is not that men perversely reject the light set before them by that school of ethics which has found its highest expression in Mr. Herbert Spencer's theories. It is simply that the deep-seated instincts of society have a truer scientific basis than our current science."

Now, what can this mean? What must the instinct be to which we owe the now antiquated proposition that right and wrong are constituted by divine enactment? It can be nothing but an implicit consciousness that moral distinctions are not for this world only; that moral nature and moral law are cosmic realities; that moral relations are not with men only, but also with unseen and transcendent Being.

What now is the definite thought which we thus extract from our author's incongruous references to religious beliefs and social instincts? It is that the social evolution may be not less well described as ethical than as religious. Its ethical character is as primary and as essential as its religious character. It is indifferent whether we speak of Christianity as an altruistic religion or as a religious altruism. Its cardinal requirement of self-renunciation, which it symbolizes by its Founder's cross, is equally distinctive both of altruism and religion in the deepest sense of each. We may affirm that altruism *is* religion when it is all-round altruism, conscious of *all* other and adjusting itself to *all* other being than itself, in recognition of relations that are not only finite, but infinite. It needs to be repeated both to our ethical-culture friends and to their critics that religion is not quite what Matthew Arnold said, "morality touched by emotion," but morality inspired by consciousness of its universal and infinite relationship. Religion is ethics translated from a geocentric into a heliocentric view of things, and from an exclusive regard to mundane and present relations into recognition also of its cosmic and eternal environment.

A book which helps us, though lamely and blindly, to discover the unity of religion and morality in the essential reality of things, has made a grateful contribution to one of the most serious problems of modern thought.

The limits of this paper require the discussion, which has been amplified at the point most important for the present purpose, to be concluded with corresponding conciseness. But, before parting with Mr. Kidd, a hearty acknowledgment is due to the service he has rendered to sound thought in his demonstration of the perilous nature of socialistic plans for eliminating competition. It is, as he shows, by the play

of competitive forces that the evolution of life has been carried on from the beginning. To eliminate these would change progress into regress. The really helpful thing is to humanize them by the increasing infusion of altruistic feeling. And this is, in effect, to give to competition a fuller scope than ever, with a corresponding quickening of the evolutionary process, by bringing all the now excluded or handicapped multitudes into the freest rivalry of life, on an equal footing of fair opportunity to become what they have it in them to be.

Finally, we have to sum up our estimate of the relative importance of the intellectual and moral factors in human progress. As to this, the historical record often shows the calamitous issues of a noble moral aim under the illusion of an intellectual error,—as in the general blight of Spain by conscientious inquisitors, or as in the spread of pauperism and unchastity in England half a century ago by the unwise administration of public charity. And this raises a doubt whether more misery and degradation have resulted from intellectual error in adopting foolish means to good ends or from moral error in the pursuit of bad ends. It is only in the long run that the moral element declares itself superior through the redeeming virtue that it involves. So wholesome water that is fouled by mud purifies itself by running, which poisoned water never can. The imperialism of the Roman Church has possessed in its theory of unselfishness a recuperative power which the imperialism of the Roman Empire lacked.

But our conclusion as to the relative importance of the intellectual and the moral factors of progress is determined by two cardinal points.

First.—While the intellectual function of adapting means to ends is common both to human nature and to brute nature, the specific difference of human nature is its moral function of seeking its true end in moral good. This, therefore, must be the cardinal factor in *human* progress.

Second.—Human nature is an indecomposable unity. What the old-fashioned psychology divided into separate tracts of mind, as feeling, intellect, will, coexist and blend, though in varying proportions, in every mental act. We are not built as it were in compartments. Moral nature is intelligently moral. To ask whether the intellectual or the moral function of our nature is the more important for human progress is like asking whether wings or lungs are the more important for the flight of a bird. Human progress in India depends equally on the moral purpose to relieve the country of its famines and on the intelligent provision of the railway communications that achieve it.

From these two points, in connection with those previously noted, another point comes into view, which we have time only to name in conclusion.

Third.—Morality, when rounded out from a hemispherical to a spherical idea, and awakened to consciousness of relations transcendent to human society, as well as immanent therein, being, as we have indicated, essentially one with religion, what follows from the fact of the indecomposable unity of mind? This follows: human nature is not only intelligently moral, as has just been said, but also intelligently religious. The normal mind must be a religious as well as a moral mind. Human progress is necessarily moral progress. And this, if we think profoundly rather than superficially, is equally and at the same time religious progress, consciously directed to the supreme moral good as fully realized only in that which is infinite and eternal.

James M. Whiton.

NATURE'S TEACHINGS.

There's a language being spoken difficult to understand.
It is surging through the ocean, it is sounding through the land.
We can trace it in the gleaming of the shining, silver sand.

Fair and fragile flower faces smile upon us from the sod,—
Messengers of love, I fancy, from an ever-thoughtful God,
Who delights to help his children to be pure and true and good.

Nature's book is worth the reading, her's, at least, is perfect art;
And the great, good Artist touches and illumines every part.
Pass it not in idle scorning: read it with both mind and heart.

So shall all your life be brightened as it never was before.
Nature is a generous giver: you will feel her goodness more
When, unasked, she freely gives you treasures from her priceless store,—

Rest and peace and healing quiet for the weary heart and brain,
Soothing with her gentle presence every vague and restless pain.
Trust her. Go to her when weary. She will comfort and sustain.

MAUD L. COTTON.

THE KNOWABLE:

AN OUTLINE CRITICISM OF HERBERT SPENCER'S PHILOSOPHY.

The scope of this investigation is limited to so much of Mr. Spencer's "First Principles" as deals with the "Knowable"; that is, to all of the second book except the last half of the "Summary and Conclusion." On page 551, at § 191, the author enters upon the relation of the "Unknowable" and the Knowable, and there we part company with him, as the remainder of his discussion is a general synthesis of the thought in both books; and, in trenching upon what he is pleased to regard as the Unknowable, he passes beyond the limits set for this study. Inasmuch as our author undertakes in the work before us to go to the very heart of knowledge and to set forth a science of sciences, and discuss the fundamental principles of sensible being, it is manifest that it would take a far more extensive work than such a paper as this to discuss the questions raised and suggested in any detail. Nothing of the sort will be attempted here. My endeavor will be simply to find the keynote to each of the three parts into which the book naturally divides, and to discuss, as briefly as may be consistent with clearness, the points thus reached.

I.

The first difficulty I meet is Mr. Spencer's conception of philosophy. He defines it as completely unified knowledge.* Perhaps it is not our business to defend our author against himself, but one can hardly avoid suggesting that this definition bars out the first book of his work, which professes to deal with the *Unknowable*, whereas he tells us that philosophy is knowledge, "completely unified knowledge,"—that the achievement for philosophy is to show that "some ultimate proposition includes and consolidates all the results of experience."* The task thus set philosophy is the natural result of his definition thereof, and I am inclined to regard it as an evidence of the falsity of the definition. It seems to me that philosophy should not be made thus directly to depend upon completeness of knowledge. I should prefer some such statement as that philosophy is a *congruous theory of the universe*. It seems to me that a man's philosophy *may* be true (I admit that it is not *likely to be*), although his knowledge is very limited; that the absence of inconsistency between the various elements which must enter into his conception of the universe is a justification of his philosophy, although his conception—true as far as it goes—may be far too vague and general for satisfactory knowledge, and although this negative "absence of inconsistency" may be far from that unification of knowledge which "includes and consolidates all the results of experience" in one "ultimate proposition."

Inasmuch as the mutual relation of subject and object is involved in all thought, and the persistence of force is the condition of all thinking, we accept these as data of philosophy with all that they imply; but we feel that the "transformation and equivalence of forces," the "direction of motion" and "rhythm," are scientific, not properly philosophical, matters. Their place in Mr. Spencer's discussion, however, finds justification in the fact that he is really discussing *science*,—the ultimate *explanation* of the universe,—the science of sciences. This, then, is the problem he is laboring on, as is shown in the next department of his discussion, which begins with the eleventh chapter, and continues through the seventeenth.

II.

In entering upon the second division of his inquiry, Mr. Spencer tells us that, although the several "truths holding of all existences," brought to light in the preceding chapters, are "of the kind required to constitute what we [Mr. Spencer] distinguish as philosophy," a philosophy cannot be formed by any number of such truths separately known. "The question is," he says, "not how *any factor*, Matter or Motion or Force, *behaves by itself* or under some imagined simple conditions; nor is it even how *one factor* behaves under the complicated conditions of actual existence. The

* Page 142.

thing to be expressed is the joint product of the factors under all its various aspects. Only when we can formulate the total process have we gained that knowledge of it which philosophy aspires to." (The Italics are mine. They are used to call attention to what seems to me a noteworthy inconsistency,—the speaking of *force* as a *single factor* here: whereas he has given us to understand that force is not a specific thing, correlative with and distinct from matter, motion, etc., but "the ultimate of ultimates," * of which whatever is, is a manifestation. If this be true, a law of *force* is not a law for *one factor*. It is a universal law, of which *all* phenomena are illustrations; and the whole truth about force is the *whole* truth about *all* transformations.) He further argues that that is not philosophy which unifies separate concrete phenomena only, or stops short with unifying separate classes of concrete phenomena: it must unify all concrete phenomena. "If the law of operation of each factor holds true throughout the cosmos, so, too, must the law of their co-operation. And hence in comprehending the cosmos as conforming to this law of co-operation must consist the highest unification which philosophy seeks." †

This being what Mr. Spencer thinks the philosopher must do, we should naturally expect, in view of his preceding analysis, a law for the distribution of matter and motion in space and time. He states that "philosophy stands self-convicted of inadequacy if it does not formulate the whole series of *changes* passed through by every existence in its passage *from the imperceptible to the perceptible, and again from the perceptible to the imperceptible*"; ‡ and, further, that the formula sought must be "equally applicable to existences taken singly and in their totality, must be applicable to the whole history of each and the whole history of all." § I have underscored the phrase "from the imperceptible," etc., because, from this point on, that is the controlling conception in Mr. Spencer's thought; and by reference to it—and only by reference to it—the seven chapters on Evolution can be explained and partially justified. As we should have anticipated, he does offer a formula for the redistribution of matter and motion in the passage of all and every existence from the imperceptible to the perceptible, and *vice versa*. This formula is to be a statement of the truth that the concentration of matter implies the dissipation of motion, and, conversely, that the absorption of motion implies the disintegration of matter. His first formulation of it which we need to consider is found in § 94, p. 281: "*Loss of motion and consequent integration, eventually followed by gain of motion and consequent disintegration,*—see here a statement comprehensive of the entire series of changes passed through." In the pages immediately following he explains that this statement is comprehensive of sensible existence at large only in a general way, in that all the changes gone through fall within it; and that, while every change furthers one or other of these processes, it is not true that either process is ever wholly unqualified by the other, that "each aggregate is at all times both gaining motion and losing motion," and that "the integration or the disintegration is a differential result." These opposite transformations he proposes to call *evolution and dissolution*. But he tells us there are two kinds of evolution to be considered. The dissipation of motion and integration of matter is "simple evolution"; but, generally, this primary redistribution of matter and motion is accompanied by secondary redistribution, constituting "compound evolution." "A concentrating aggregate which loses its contained motion rapidly, or integrates quickly, exhibits only simple evolution; but, in proportion as its largeness or the peculiar constitution of its components hinders the dissipation of its motion, its parts, while undergoing that primary redistribution which results in integration, undergo secondary redistributions, producing more or less complexity."

It is at this point that we may ask ourselves how much of this we can accept. That integration of matter does imply—for the aggregate thus formed, considered by itself—dissipation of motion; and that in like manner, for the special aggregate under consideration, disintegration of matter is the accompaniment of absorption of motion; and, *vice versa*, that dissipation of the motion of an aggregate implies aggregation

* Page 169; see also pp. 190–192, 197–202, 58–61, *et passim*.

† Page 541. ‡ Page 541. § Page 542.

of the matter, and absorption of motion by an aggregate implies disintegration of its matter,—I presume we may take for granted, as necessary implications of the conceptions "matter" and "motion." Further than this, we may accept without hesitation the statement that the *integration of matter and accompanying dissipation of motion* is a correct formulation of the change which takes place in the *passage from the imperceptible to the perceptible.* The two phrases mean exactly the same thing. Without stopping to discuss whether *wholly* disintegrated matter is a legitimate conception, it will be sufficient to recognize that it must be imperceptible; that perceptibility depends upon a certain degree of integration of matter; and that, in like manner, the disintegration of matter is the passage from the perceptible to the imperceptible.

The "law," then, of evolution (simple) and dissolution is simply another statement of the fact that all and every existence passes from the imperceptible to the perceptible, and from the perceptible to the imperceptible; and that, when it is not doing one, it is the other, or else it is doing neither! Doubtless a very profound truth, especially when the last alternative mentioned, that of equilibrium, is considered! But, profound as it may be, it does not enlighten us greatly as to the past or the future.

So far we have considered "simple evolution," but Mr. Spencer spends most of his time in the consideration of "compound evolution." What of it? I should say this: that, while evolution and dissolution are rather arbitrary terms for integration and disintegration, no harm is worked by their use so long as they are consistently used in that sense, but that the conception of "compound evolution" is quite a different thing, according to Mr. Spencer's own words: "We shall by dissolution everywhere mean . . . the absorption of motion and disintegration of matter; we shall everywhere mean by evolution the process which is always an integration of matter and dissipation of motion, but which is in *most cases much more than this.*" Now, if this compound evolution is (simple) evolution *plus* something else, the terms ought not to be used interchangeably: it is not the correlative of dissolution (why not "compound dissolution"?), and that which is true of (simple) evolution and dissolution should not be assumed to be predicable of compound evolution and dissolution. Yet Mr. Spencer does use "evolution" interchangeably of simple and compound evolution, and contrasts the latter with dissolution (simple). Let us look at his final formula of what he calls "evolution," without qualification: "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." Considering the several new predicates introduced, we may pass over "coherent" and "incoherent" as being mere repetitions of integrated and disintegrated, in so far as they belong in the formula of evolution. In so far as they have a different connotation, they are illegitimately introduced. Chapter XIV., in which the term "coherent" is developed, is, as he tells us at the end of Chapter XIII., intended to set forth primary or simple evolution; *i.e.*, integration of matter and dissipation of motion.

When carefully analyzed, the same thing will be seen to be true of heterogeneity; to wit, that in one sense it is implied in integration, and that in no other sense is it entitled to a place in the formula of evolution, if we are to consider Mr. Spencer's first definition as the controlling one. The sense in which heterogeneity is implied in integration of matter and dissipation of motion—*i.e.*, in the passage from the imperceptible to the perceptible—is perhaps a little abstruse; and I shall postpone its discussion to the third division of this paper, in which we enter upon the interpretation of evolution. Here we need only note two things. First, that in the chapter (XV.) in which our author discusses heterogeneity he slips from that use of evolution which he has defined (integration of matter and dissipation of motion) to the use of the term as equivalent to *progress*,—a very large and vague term, expressing something with which he is concerned to identify evolution, and in which he succeeds by the simple expedient of using the one term for the other before he has done anything to prove their oneness; and at the same time, as a result of this identification of evolution and prog-

ress, he passes from the consideration of the *integration* of MATTER to the *progress* of such IMMATERIAL things as art, religion, etc. !

Second, he himself in Chapter XVI. gives cases of heterogeneity accompanying what he regards as dissolution, and cases accompanying what he regards as integration of matter, but which he nevertheless regards as not coming "within what we [Mr. Spencer] call evolution."

Turning our attention now to "definiteness," we feel moved to remark that, as he uses it, this is a highly indefinite characteristic. In a sense, it is true (as we may see more fully later) increase of definiteness is implied in integration; but, as Mr. Spencer uses it, it has no necessary connection either with integration or with progress. The definition of definiteness with which he starts, so far as he has one, is given in the second and third sentences of § 129,— "order" and "distinctness with which . . . parts are marked off from one another." In his discussion of this characteristic the same looseness is to be observed as in the chapter on Heterogeneity. We may note further that in next to the last paragraph of § 131 the implication is that *indefinite* heterogeneous integration of matter was a *stage* in the evolutionary progress of the earth. We might also inquire whether the yolk of a newly laid egg has not a more definite disposition of parts than it has when the hatching process is in an early stage. We may grant that the later stages of the hatching process shows more definiteness than earlier stages, and yet maintain that prior to this relative indefiniteness was a relatively greater definiteness. Even when he passes from evolution as integration to evolution as progress, the same sort of criticism may be passed upon Mr. Spencer's argument. Was the feudal system, or is the caste system of India, any less definite than the social system of France at the present time?

To summarize the conclusions reached in this division of our investigation, we may say that Mr. Spencer has given us *two formulas* for "the whole series of changes passed through by every existence in its passage from the imperceptible to the perceptible, and again from the perceptible to the imperceptible"; and, by implication, he has told us that this series of changes constitutes the sum of the knowable, and that its formulation is the "law" of the knowable universe, which he believes it the business of philosophy to seek. But these two formulas differ *toto cœlo*, although both are by him expressed as "evolution and dissolution." Taking the first, we may regard it as a true but somewhat empty expression of the whole of reality, considered under the aspect of matter and motion, space and time. But he has not yet told us when there will be evolution or when dissolution,— simply, that the universe as a whole and every part of it is either exhibiting the integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion or the disintegration of matter concomitant with the absorption of motion,— parts of any specific aggregate perhaps in process of dissolution while as a whole it is in process of evolution; for he explained that "the integration or the disintegration is a *differential result*." With regard to his other formula,—of which the evolutionary half is found at the end of Chapter XVII., and is reached as a result of the discussion of "compound" evolution, or the "secondary redistributions" of matter and motion,—it is contradictory of the "simple evolution" formula, since it makes evolution to consist of "simple evolution," *plus* something else; and in the course of the discussion he tells us in several places that integration of matter and dissipation of motion, *which according to him constitutes simple evolution*, is not evolution * unless there be also present increasing heterogeneity and definiteness. If the first formula, then, is true, we must reject this final formula as false. But, aside from this *a priori* consideration, we find *a posteriori* that it is not universally true that there is *either* dissolution *or* "an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinitely incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation,"—in the sense in which Mr. Spencer uses these terms. We therefore reject his final formula of evolution, and regard his formula of *simple* evolution and dissolution—his formula of integration and

Cf. beginning of Chapter XVI.

disintegration—as too indefinite to have value.

III.

Believing that he has reached a satisfactory "Law of Evolution" by induction, Mr. Spencer thinks it necessary to verify this by deducing it from the ultimate principle which he has already accepted as the first of laws or principles, transcending experience and the condition of all thought, namely, the *Persistence of Force.* First, he tries to show that "any finite homogeneous aggregate must inevitably lose its homogeneity" (and a less heterogeneous aggregate must become more heterogeneous) "through the unequal exposure of its parts to incident forces." This he calls the instability of the homogeneous. If we were at liberty to suppose that matter and motion were possible apart from each other, this principle might stand. Given a homogeneous mass of matter existing wholly *without motion*, and the application of a uniform motion to it would produce heterogeneity; but this is, of course, an impossible hypothesis, and therefore valueless, even if true.

Yet we must suppose that some such fanciful abstraction was in Mr. Spencer's mind when he propounded his law of the instability of the homogeneous. For, if different parts of the whole under consideration were so disposed in reference to an incident force that it would affect them differently, they must be already heterogeneous *in that respect.* If they were *not* so disposed, the force could not leave them heterogeneous. Strictly, scientifically, the persistence of force does not require the "instability of the homogeneous" or the "multiplication of effects." *You will get out just what you find in* (or put into) *the given phenomenon.* Popularly speaking, it is true that the application of a uniform force will often make homogeneous matter heterogeneous. That is to say, regarding matter simply as matter,—namely, the *substance* of the matter,—it may be homogeneous; but it must already be heterogeneous in *the relations* of its parts in space. And, further than this, a less heterogeneous mass may become *more* heterogeneous from the application of a uniform force (speaking in the popular sense above referred to), which is in direct contradiction of Mr. Spencer's principle, if he meant it in the popular sense. *E.g.*, a tub of water, of which the surface is a little warmer than the bottom, say on a summer day, may be made of a more uniform temperature by the application of great heat. Spencer's doctrine of the "multiplicity of effects" is open to the same line of criticism. In a popular sense, it seems true in most cases that a force uniform *in kind*, even when it impinges upon an aggregate of matter uniform *in kind*, results in different effects. This *is* true, as stated. But the fallacy is in considering the force *first* in reference to its nature or *kind*, and *then* in reference to its *method of working.* The quantity and direction of the resulting momenta, it is said, differ from the quantity and direction of the original force. But how far, and in what sense, is this true? The quantity or direction of the part *A* of the uniform force, which strikes part *a* of the uniform aggregate, must have been different from the quantity or direction of part *B*, affecting part *b*, if A (the effect of the application of *A* to *a*) differs from B (the effect of the application of *B* to *b*). In other words, although both force and aggregate were uniform in their respective natures, considered each by itself, the force as *cause* was as multiform as the effect. It *affects* part *a* differently from part *b*, because more or less of it struck part *a* than did part *b*, or because it struck these parts at different angles; that is, because as *cause* it differed in each case. As to Spencer's doctrine of segregation, it is valuable to him only in connection with that of the instability of the homogeneous and the multiplication of effects. So we need hardly discuss it if we do not accept those doctrines or his formula of (compound) evolution. Here, again, we may repeat that *we only get what we had.* To quote an illustration from Professor Mezes,* the segregation consists in the gathering together of things like in reference to the force, but perhaps unlike in all other respects. We do not, under the influence of the wind in autumn, get the oak leaves in one place and the maples in another, but the unresisting oak and maple leaves together. Similarly, under the influence of a strong wind, it is not the animal matter that is carried to one point, the vegetable

* My thanks are due to Prof. S. E. Mezes, now of the University of Texas, for starting me upon this critical examination.

to another, and the inorganic to a third, but the light objects—mineral, vegetable, and animal—to one place, and the heavier ones to another.

Of *dissolution*, as discussed by Mr. Spencer, we need say little here, except in so far as its relation to evolution is discussed, under the head of *equilibration*. This is really the crucial point in the whole system; and, without going into the details of his discussion, it may be said that it is very unsatisfactory. He fails to tell us when or how evolution will cease and dissolution begin. He tells us in one place that evolution will result in equilibrium, or "rest" (pp. 485, 549). But in § 183 he tells us that, motions and matter "being fixed in quantity, it would seem that the change in the distribution of matter which motion effects, coming to a limit in whichever direction it is carried, the indestructible motion thereupon necessitates a reverse distribution." This conclusion is the best one he reaches; and, if he would always bear it in mind, his theory would have greater consistency and completeness. But his specific deductions and speculations are inconsistent with this very often. And even this doctrine suffers from the practical disadvantage of giving us no information as to when the change from evolution to dissolution is to take place, and from the theoretical disadvantage of the impossibility of conceiving of limits to the universe. The process changes when the limits are reached. This would imply that, when the dissipated motion has reached the outer walls of the universe and been reflected therefrom, the absorption of motion and disintegration of matter will set in.

Integration of matter is in its primary and initial stages the passage of the imperceptible into the perceptible. It is in this aspect of the case that definiteness and heterogeneity are implied in integration. For fulness of perception is dependent upon definiteness of conformation; and, as we cannot define except by means of difference,—as definiteness of form means clear separation of the whole from all else, and of the several parts one from another,—definiteness implies heterogeneity. If this were the sense in which Mr. Spencer used these terms, his formula might be true. For in this sense it *is* true that the whole series of changes passed through by every (material) existence and by the totality of (such) existence in its passage from the imperceptible to the perceptible, and again from the perceptible to the imperceptible, is expressed by a predominant dissipation of motion concomitant with a concentrated, determinate, and multiform arrangement of matter, which, having attained a maximum, will be followed by absorption of motion concomitant with uniform, indeterminate diffusion of matter. But of the value of this formula I have nothing to say. It is to be noted that here is nothing to determine when the maximum is attained, and this is the important thing.

Frederic W. Sanders.
University of Chicago.

INSPIRATION.

The belief concerning the connection between God and his creation, which represents the Deity as the indwelling life of the universe, is at once philosophically sound and practically devotional. The world is not a vast machine, set going ages ago and left to work itself ever since, but a perpetual manifestation of the presence, the glory, and the goodness of God. We have learned from the process of evolution that God is more closely related to nature than we previously imagined. In place of a nature moving under fixed, mechanical law, we rise to the conception of a nature filled with the Spirit of God as the source of all life and the fount of all energy. We dismiss the master mechanic of the Deists of the last century, and realize instead the immanent and yet transcendent God of the Psalmist and Isaiah, of Jesus and Paul. Nor in so conceiving God do we rob him of his independent personality, since our belief in his personality is derived not from without by the study of nature, but from within by the study of our own consciousness. We ourselves are parts of nature, having received from it our physical organism, and being permeated by its forces, as heat, light, and electricity. Yet still we are aware of a self-conscious personality which lifts us above material nature, and which is, indeed, our truest self. So we can think of God as pervading all things with his life and energy and yet as personal. Thus, if we accept the last word on evolution, and consent

to include both life and man in that order of development which God has chosen as the pathway of his activity, we have parted with a more or less localized conception of God for the great treasure of a universal one, we have exchanged the narrow idea of finding him only in some special act of creation for the broad idea of finding him in every act, we have abandoned the idea of a languid and intermittent providence over his creatures to welcome with ardor the idea of an indwelling Providence which knows no pause or interval or end. What we call the laws of nature are the methods by which he ceaselessly works. The powers of our own bodies are the gifts of his mercy. All the faculties of our minds are produced and maintained by his instrumentality. He has given us a separate individual being with a free will; but it is none the less true that "in him we live and move and have our being."

This inspiring divine agency is common to all mankind. There are some thinkers who can see no inspiration beyond this, and who say that it only differs in different men in its *direction*, making Raphael a painter, Shakespeare a poet, and Christ a prophet. But in every religion there has prevailed a conviction that in addition to this there is a personal connection possible between God and man. The devout are said to "walk with God." The loving, faithful child feels that "the Father is with him." Inspiration, as I use the word, is a personal communion and intercourse between the human soul and the divine spirit,—a conscious dwelling with God. The inspired man enjoys a conscious contact with God *in addition* to the unceasing divine influence by which he lives and thinks and feels.

The belief in such inspiration naturally follows from that recognition of God as a person which is essential to all experience of religion. If we think of the Almighty only as an indwelling influence, a spirit of nature, a great necessity, the embodiment of law, we cannot love him, trust him, or pray to him. But, when we believe in God as a Father who feels toward each of us a personal love, the soul, ever encompassed by his care, ever blest by his goodness, longs to express its faith and thankfulness, and discerns that spiritual communion is possible, that it can know and be known, can speak and be answered, can come nearer and nearer to God, and become at last spiritually one with him. Thus to know God is a very different thing from merely knowing about God. I may illustrate this by pointing out the difference between these two things in regard to our fellow-beings.

There is many a man whose character of goodness we reverence, or whose works of genius we admire, or whose teachings of wisdom we profit by, whom, nevertheless, we do not know. When we gaze on the painting, or are touched by the melody, or find our hearts echo to the poetry of the artist; when we con the lessons and drink in the wisdom of the philosopher; when we rejoice in the benefits and avail ourselves of the discoveries and wonder at the achievements of the practical benefactors of mankind,—we fully believe in their existence, we fully recognize their powers; but, with all this, we may never *know* them. How different will be our feelings, should we have the privilege of being their friends! How much better shall we then understand and appreciate their works! Especially in the case of the moral leaders of the world, what a benefit it is, no longer merely to know of them through their writings, but to call them our friends, to have personal communion with them! So it is true religion not only to see God's being proved by his creation, not only to believe in his love because we profit by his beneficence, but to have personal acquaintance with him, to hold conversations of the spirit with him, to be able to say, "He is my God, and I am his child," to feel he is with us as a brother man is with us, but in yet closer and nearer companionship, because a spiritual union is more real and true than any mere physical nearness can be.

This personal connection with God may be attained to by every human being. All the more spiritual writers of the Old Testament, and yet more Christ and his apostles, speak of it as a reality, describe themselves as having experienced it. All the founders of great religious movements in modern days—Fox, Wesley, Swedenborg—have insisted upon it. Under various names the belief in such inspiration has been the great thought of the vital fervent Christianity of each succeeding age since the time when our Master gave the promise of the

Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, to abide with his followers forever.

To many persons it may sound startling to claim for all men the capability of gaining an inspiration similar in kind to that possessed by the apostles. But we find no statement in the words of Christ that inspiration was limited to a chosen few. In the first era of Christianity we are told that the Spirit was poured out upon all flesh. And, if there be any truth in the assertion that man is made in God's image, capable of being a partaker of the divine nature, what reason have we for doubting that the child and the Father may converse together? It makes a belief in the inspiration of Christ and his apostles easy and natural, and removes many difficulties to see in that inspiration an exalted instance of a general fact rather than an exception to all other human experience. The Almighty is not partial in any of his gifts. The same sun which shone on the corn-fields of Judea ripens the wheat for us to-day; the same home love which united the hearts of mother and son at Nazareth, and bound together brothers and sisters at Bethany, is found in the homes of England and America; the same intellectual power which was granted to wise men of old has been renewed to each generation since. If God thus gives physical blessings, affections, minds, to all ages alike, why, then, should we believe that he confines his highest, choicest gift to one people or certain periods of the world? Why should we suppose that he spoke to Hebrew prophets, Galilean fishermen, early Christians, but that since that day his voice is never heard, and that we must look for it and listen for it in vain? In trust on that Spirit who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, we may surely seek, hoping to find; we may draw nigh to God, believing that he will draw nigh to us.

Understanding by inspiration the personal communion between God and a human soul, and believing that such communion is possible to all who rightly seek it, I have to ask the further questions: How does inspiration act? By what means is it to be gained? To what extent can we profit by other men's inspiration? How do these views bear on our estimate and use of the Scriptures?

In considering these questions, let me revert to the illustration of the influence which one man may exert over another, as this analogy will help us.

There can be no hearty, genuine friendship between two men who are totally opposed to one another in moral character. Between the good and the bad, the pure and the impure, the virtuous and the vicious, there is a great gulf fixed. He who is the slave of bad habits, the creature of appetite and passion, cannot understand and sympathize with the man of principle, the pure-minded and conscientious. In like manner God's children feel his presence and hear his voice only when they approach his moral character. "The pure in heart shall see God." The essential prerequisite for spiritual communion with him is freedom from iniquity, tenderness of conscience, moral purity. The popular instinct appears to feel this when it derides with scorn the claims of a religious teacher who is known to be self-indulgent and vicious. On the other hand, every new conquest over evil, every additional clearness of moral vision and strength of moral purpose and resolution, enable a man to know God better and to feel more of his influence.

To this moral prerequisite must be added religious thought and feeling. In other words, the spiritual part of our nature must be exercised and cultivated; and the result will be the felt presence of the heavenly Father with his human offspring. He that would gain this must be self-devoted, active about God's work, ready to sacrifice pleasure to duty, taking more interest in spiritual than in material things. We see this in Christ. He grew up to manhood before he received his inspiration; his character was formed; his moral nature was cultivated; he felt, but conquered, temptation. Then he devoted himself to a great work: he gave up everything else in order to do God's will in the spiritual realm; he had the thought of God always in his mind; he made communion with God the habitual gesture of his heart and mind; and, as a consequence of this moral resemblance to God, he felt the divine presence, and walked with God, till at last he became spiritually one with the Father.

But such inspiration does not supersede the use of our own natural powers. It has been a common error to distinguish between natural and revealed religion, or to contrast

the authority of reason and revelation. We are sometimes told that, whenever inspiration comes, argument is out of place, the understanding should be put on one side, the conscience need not guide us. The notion prevails that inspiration says, "This is true," and we need only believe it; "this is right," and we have but to do it. But the only effect of the conscious presence of God is to quicken and intensify our own powers. The company of some men makes us feel more able and more anxious to do right than we were before. The society of other men stimulates our mental powers, and makes us more thoughtful, more far-seeing, more acute, than we were at other times. The presence of a benevolent person seems to spread an atmosphere of love around, making all within the sphere of his influence disposed to feel and act kindly. So the presence of God stimulates the best affections of the heart, and strengthens the noblest powers of the mind. It makes the conscience clearer and the will stronger. It does not do any of our work for us, but helps us to do it. Still has the inspired man to find out truth, to prove or disprove his belief, by his reason. Still has he to struggle with temptation, and be free from sin by his own will. But these natural powers are raised by inspiration to a higher state and a nobler position than any to which they could otherwise attain. Christ and his apostles argued, thought, and reasoned, were liable to sin, felt temptation, and needed to contend against it. But the presence of God with them gave their minds an additional power to perceive truth, and their wills a renewed power to conquer evil.

And, if inspiration does not supersede the use of the natural powers in him who feels it, still less can his being inspired render self-exertion unnecessary to others. We are often told that, if we have a teacher like Christ, all we have to do is to listen to him and obey him. It would be difficult to enumerate all the evils that have arisen from people being content with this second-hand morality and religion, trying to read with another man's eye and to believe by another man's understanding. The only true virtue arises from the enlightened state of the individual conscience, and from obedience to it. The only vital piety arises from the awakened state of the individual soul and the warmth of the affections toward God.

The only real belief is when the understanding is addressed and has been convinced. Is, then, other men's inspiration useless to us? No more than Newton's "Principia" is useless to the philosopher. He leads on the learner, step by step, guiding him to truths he could not by himself have discovered. But the true philosopher does not take any point for granted, tests everything as he goes on, never believes a statement merely because Newton says so. He, at least, has a system of natural philosophy which is his own, proved to his own mind, and accepted by his own understanding, but which he could never have gained, had not Newton preceded him. So the Christian is guided by Christ to spiritual truth; but he examines it for himself, he embraces it, not solely because Christ teaches it, but principally because it approves itself to his own mind. At the same time he is a disciple of Christ, because, had it not been for Christ, he could not have possessed the spiritual light and knowledge in which he now rejoices. Further than this, there is an influence shed abroad by every inspired man on all with whom he comes in contact,—a reflection of the influence which shines on his own soul from God. He leads us to truth, which each of us verifies by the use of his own individual powers. He quickens within us the noblest love, and arouses the highest powers of conscience, and guides us to a moral position to which without his influence few of us would attain.

This view clears away many of the difficulties from the questions referring to the use and explanation of the Scriptures. The parts of the Bible to which we attach most value are those which lead us to God, and therefore come from the influence of God's spirit,—those which inspire us, and are therefore inspired, those which liberate and lift us, which sweeten, strengthen, and console us. These writings, by showing us what their authors believed, suggest thoughts such as, perhaps, we should never have conceived without them. Yet more, the Scriptures give a moral and spiritual influence such as we can derive from no other source in an equal degree. The Bible is not intended, as a whole or in any of its parts, to afford us a system of theology or a code of

morality; but it is intended to afford those principles in accordance with which all true theology must be framed, and the influence which tends to foster moral purity and moral power. Whatever part of it inspires is most useful, not to supersede or render unnecessary our seeking inspiration, each for himself, but to help us to feel this inspiration, and to guide us to it.

These hints on an important and difficult subject do not pretend to a complete and detailed treatment of it. Their purpose will be answered if they induce the reader to think upon it carefully, and to test, by his own mind and judgment, the following assertions concerning it:—

1. Inspiration consists in the *personal* communion between God and a human soul, in addition to the universal presence and agency of God with all men.

2. Inspiration is possible to every one who rightly seeks it.

3. The means of obtaining it are, moral purity, active performance of duty, religious thought and feeling.

4. The effect of inspiration is not to supersede the natural intellect and conscience, but to quicken and stimulate all the higher powers of our being.

5. The inspiration of other men does not render inquiry and effort on our part unnecessary, but leads us on to ideas which each one must verify for himself, and especially spreads a valuable spiritual influence.

6. The Bible, in those parts in which it vivifies and energizes, is to be used to help our own powers, not to silence them. Its great purpose is to exercise a moral and religious influence, to establish fundamental principles, rather than to set up definite systems of theology or ethics.

S. Fletcher Williams.
Hackney, London, Eng.

PATIENCE.

Brave and content, then, come what may,
We face what time may send,
Life cannot be all holiday,
And love and hope alike decay,
And disappointments bar the way
Sometimes until the end;
But we can bear all, knowing this,—
God rules the years, and we are his.

Susan Coolidge.

GIBRALTAR AND TANGIERS.

Nothing could be more ideal than the approach to Gibraltar,—on the right the hills of Africa, on the left the shores of Spain, dotted with quaint stone towers, built as watch-towers for protection against the Moorish pirates.

Gibraltar rises from the sea about 1,500 feet: one end is perpendicular, the other end is irregular. The town lies on the western slopes of the rocky mountain. On the north is the neutral ground, reaching to the Spanish territory.

The landing must be made in small boats, as no piers are allowed. Getting ashore is most uncomfortable for the traveller unacquainted with Oriental ways, for Gibraltar is more "Oriental than the Orient."

There is such noise and confusion of tongues, such gesticulations, men of so many nations and such variety of costumes, that the stranger is bewildered; and yet bargain he must if he is not willing to pay most extortionate prices both for his own boat-fare and that of his luggage.

Committing ourselves to the care of one hotel porter and leaving him to fight off the others, we passed the gate into the walled town, and obtained at the custom-house little tickets stating our nationality, and permitting us to remain over night in Gibraltar. The traveller found twenty-four hours in Gibraltar without such a ticket must pay a fine of about forty dollars.

The streets of the town are narrow, and paved with cobble-stones. The place is even noisier than Naples. Donkeys bray, carts rattle over the pavement, men shout in known and unknown tongues, bands play, the soldiers march through the streets to their posts; and, as night advances, the noises wax louder. I believe the people never even make a pretence of going to bed in Gibraltar.

Spaniards from Algeciras, Moors from Tarifa and Tangiers, Bedouins from the desert, Jews in skull-cap and slippers, looking like so many Shylocks, English soldiers in their red uniforms, and others in undress costumes of white, Englishmen fresh from the hand of a Bond Street tailor, tourists from all parts of the world, jostle one another in the narrow streets of the little

town. I believe all the languages of the earth might be heard in its streets.

The Alameda, or park, planted by the English, is beautiful: only it is a little startling to see a huge cannon embedded in a clump of roses. It is literally cannon to the right and cannon to the left all through the beautiful park. Here we met pretty English children with their nurses, fine horses and carriages. In fact, we found the place a small Hyde Park. The Englishman always carries a little bit of England with him wherever he goes, and English and comfort become almost synonymous terms to the traveller.

But crawling things of all kinds are much too plentiful in Gibraltar hotels to make them abodes of peace and comfort. The Alameda, the market, the subterranean galleries blasted out of the solid rock, and the monkeys are the sights of Gibraltar. But the street life, the mingling of so many different nationalities, such picturesque and singular costumes, mark the real characteristics of Gibraltar. Nature has been so lavish in her gift of beauty to the countries lying about the Mediterranean. The sky so blue, the sea a deeper blue and at sunset tinted like an opal, the vine-clad hills of Spain, the silent shores of Africa, and these magnificent Pillars of Hercules guarding the straits unite to form a picture lovelier than a poet's dream. No wonder the nations have contended for this rock fortress. There are traces of Roman occupation. The Moors held it; and a castle in the town bears in Arabic over the gate, "Erected in 725 by Abu Abel Hazeg."

During the war of the Spanish succession the English took it, and have since held it, notwithstanding many attacks made by the Spanish and French. The brave defence against a siege which lasted four years proved the power of the English to hold it. It is now considered impregnable; and the pride and the feeling of ownership with which Englishmen talk of "Gib" make it quite certain that, when Mr. Bright declared in Parliament that "the expenses involved in holding and fortifying Gibraltar were much beyond its value to England," he did not express the general opinion of his countrymen.

The Phœnicians—so tradition has it—came to Cadiz shortly after the destruction of Troy; and, in coasting along the Mediterranean, they arrived at this mountain, which they called Calpe, and erected a Pillar of Hercules (a huge pyramid) and another at Abyla, modern Ceuta, considering these the limits of the world. The channel between Europe and Africa must have been very narrow in that period. Savants claim that there was once an isthmus between the two continents. The monkeys on the rock of Gibraltar are cited as proof of this theory, as monkeys are to be found in no other part of Spain. Mark Twain says the "monkeys persistently refuse to leave the rock because they wish to verify this theory."

It is only a sail of a few hours from Gibraltar to Tangiers; that is, from Europe to Africa.

Realizing that we might never have another opportunity to visit the "dark continent," we decided to sail across the Straits and visit the former pirates of Morocco, whom the United States so valiantly chastised.

If we had quite realized what a landing in Tangiers meant, I doubt if we should have attempted the trip. An English officer who had served in the Indian mutiny, told us that he was afraid to go to Tangiers with his wife. However, we boarded the "Hercules," put ourselves under the protection of the kindly English captain, and sailed for Africa. The day was perfect; and, although the passage is somewhat rough because of the swiftness of the current, as soon as the shores of Spain disappear, the hills of Africa come in sight. The Spanish shores are dotted with fertile valleys, with orange groves and vines; and the hills are planted with the dusty-hued olive-trees. The shores of Africa rise silent and untilled,—a land of mystery to the moderns as well as the ancients.

We soon entered the bay of Tangier; and the town is seen in the distance upon the coast, with its background of hill. There is no pier, and here, too, the landing must be made in small boats. The steamer anchored a short distance out, and was at once surrounded by scores of boats filled by half-naked Moors and Jews, yelling, gesticulating, and even seizing the luggage.

Then we understood why the English officer was afraid to bring his wife to Tan-

giers. But the captain of the "Hercules" took us under his protection, and called a courier of one of the hotels from the boats, and told him to take us to his hotel. Accompanying the courier was the most dignified of turbaned Turks, who looked us over with great hauteur, and called some Jews to take our bags.

Once in the boat, it was a constant fight, on the part of the courier, the dignified Moor, and the Jews in our boat, to prevent those wading to their waists in the water around our boats from forcibly taking our bags. I even thought for some minutes they would take us out of the boat and compel us to go on shore on their backs, the only mode of landing in Tangiers a few years ago.

The landing consisted of stone steps built up from the sea to a covered passageway leading to the custom-house, which, as far as we could tell, consisted of a porch, or doorway, in which two white-robed Moors squatted. They seemed to be asleep when our bags were presented for their inspection. But finally, when a Moor and a Jew, who each had hold of one of our bags, had been quarrelling violently for some minutes, and we had given up the bag as doomed to destruction, one of the officials woke up, moved his hand, and, lo! all was peace; and we passed on through narrow lanes, paved with cobble-stones, and winding and turning like a labyrinth. Donkeys seemed to hold the right of way; and, as the streets are not more than four or five feet wide, we were obliged to keep on the alert.

Not a white man or woman to be seen; but Jews, Moors, Bedouins from the desert, Negroes, and now and then a woman all in white, and closely veiled, would glide past, keeping close to the wall. For the pure, unadulterated foreign, nothing can compete with Tangiers,—sounds, sights, and smells wholly strange and unknown. If we had suddenly been set upon Mars, we could not have felt more strange and far off from our own people.

It was with a feeling of intense relief that we found ourselves within a hotel, where all seemed of our world, even to the electric lights and the chromos on the walls.

Our guide-book mentions the Café du Pays as one of the sights of Tangiers to be seen between 8 and 9 P.M. The guide looked a little surprised when I proposed going, but we started, a Moor going ahead with a lantern; and reason there was for the lantern. Egyptian darkness is a phrase I have often heard. I know what it is now. With the aid of the lantern we picked our way over the slippery cobble-stones, and climbed some rickety stairs to a small room filled with the most villanous-looking Moors. The faint light and the tobacco-laden air were not inviting; and we turned and fled. Then we passed through an arcade, where we could discern the outlines of wretched-looking creatures crouching about. This, the guide informed us, was "a kind of poorhouse; and inside is the hospital." Ghostly figures, some in white, others in dark garments, each carrying a lantern, passed us, or seemed to be lurking in the dark corners and doorways. It was a little too much for our nerves, and we told the guide to take us back to the hotel.

A bridal procession passed the hotel that evening. It was much like the procession in the Midway at the World's Fair,—the bride borne in a closed palanquin, preceded by Moors carrying lanterns, and followed by many others beating tom-toms. Indeed, all Tangiers seemed like a bit out of the "Arabian Nights."

Tanja, "the city protected by the Lord," is very old, probably the oldest on the African coast. Tradition has it, Jews came here in time of King David, and that Phœnicians and the Carthaginians came before the siege of Troy. Julius Cæsar is said to have fitted out in its port the fleet with which he invaded England.

Many of the Jews exiled from Europe during the Middle Ages took refuge here; but the greater portion of the Jews are descended from those sent out of Spain in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Moors driven out of Granada by Ferdinand and Isabella also came to Morocco.

Although the Jews have no separate quarter in Tangiers, the laws are severe against them. Their taxes are very heavy, and they are compelled to dress in dark colors. The Moors wear white, and those that are married wear the turban. The sheerif is head of the church, prince of the faithful, and the absolute autocrat. Neither life nor property is secure unless under protection of

the foreign consuls. One of our American consuls is said to have made many American citizens at the rate of two hundred dollars each. The imperial family is mulatto, and the Moors de Rey (the soldiers) are almost black. The Sok, or market-place, with its groups of Moors, Reefians from the mountains, Arabs from the desert, Jews, and women enveloped in their white haiks, the snake-charmers, the camels, donkeys, and the strange-looking fruit and vegetables, is one of the principal sights of Tangiers. The prisons where the prisoners are chained and treated in the most barbarous manner, are exhibited at a peseta entrance fee. We declined to enter these abodes of misery: the descriptions are heart-rending enough. The faces of the women (of course, of the lower class) will long haunt me because of their expression of hopeless misery. The dirt and wretchedness of the town and the people make a stay there painful. But, out on the hills above the town, the villas with their beautiful tropical gardens, the blue sea in the foreground, with the city on the shore, with its square, box-like houses, like so many white tombs, with a *patio*, or court, in the centre of each, make a beautiful landscape. The foreign residents all live in the villas on the hills. There are 15,000 inhabitants in Tangiers, and only 400 of these are Europeans.

If our boodle aldermen and other criminals, some of the "exiles" of whom Richard Harding Davis has written, were compelled to live in Tangiers, and were not allowed to live in the beautiful villas on the hills, their punishment would exceed even what their victims would think they deserved.

The visit to Tangiers was a unique experience, and enabled one to have some idea of an Oriental city.

But I must confess that it was with a feeling of relief that I saw our party safely on board the "Hercules," and under the protection of the British flag and the kind captain, and on our way to Gibraltar.

MARIE C. REMICK.

In judging others, we should remember that to be noble in small things is as difficult as to be noble in great. To throw far a feather is not more easy than to throw far a stone. —*Ivan Panin.*

A UNITARIAN APOSTLE IN THE KHASI HILLS, INDIA.

To the Editor of the Unitarian: —

On the 24th of February, 1894, I went to the village of Mokhap (Raliang) in connection with survey work. There is a Christian (Methodist) settlement close to this village, and there it is that Brother David lives. In the evening Brother David and his friends came to the house where I put up.

We sang several hymns from our Hymn Book, and then we offered prayer to God. After that I entertained them with a small magic lantern which I brought there for the purpose. On the following morning, Sunday, several Methodists came to me. Many hymns were sung, and I explained the meaning of some of them. I then explained the principles of the Unitarian faith, with illustrations taken from the daily life, and contrasted them with the Khasi demon-worship and the faith of the Trinitarians, and also briefly told the friends there the history of the Unitarian gospel from the time of Jesus down to the present day, and its strength and position as it now stands. An old Methodist who was present there expressed his religious belief to me very clearly, which was nothing but Unitarianism. I asked him how he could remain in the Trinitarian church so long with such beliefs, and told him that by remaining there he deceived that church and also the world. He said God is the same there as everywhere. I told him to consider well and weigh in his mind what he has heard from me. The meeting was then closed with prayer offered by Brother David.

On Sunday, the 25th of March, there were presbytery meetings of the Calvinist Methodists at Jowai, and many of them came to Jowai almost from all parts of the hills. I thought that the attendance at our services would be very small; but, contrary to expectations, our small shed was full, and in one of the meetings a renowned native minister of the Methodists also came to join with us in our worship. I took the opportunity to give notice that tracts and pamphlets illustrating our faith would be given gratis to any person desirous to read them, but only a few of the Methodists came to us for them.

On the 28th of April I went to Nartiang where there were four persons (now five) who joined our Union some time before. I was accompanied by three children of the Unitarian Mission School at Jowai.

After holding religious services and preaching during the daytime, we held a special meeting in the evening; and one elderly woman was received into our society. After prayer on Monday morning we returned to Jowai.

Having previously obtained privilege leave for two months, I set out on the 8th of May, 1894, to visit Shillong, Cherrapoonpee, and other places in the Khasi Hills. We passed the night of the 8th at Máwlyngkneng, and it happened that the house where we put up was that of a new convert to Methodism. I asked the inmates if they had any objection to our offering prayer. They said they had none, because they are Christians. They asked us, "Are you Unitarians who worship only one God?" "Yes, we are," I promptly responded. We sang some of our hymns, and they gladly joined with us. I distributed Khasi Tracts (Nos. 1 and 2) to several young men present, and asked them if they were not afraid of their minister for taking our literature. They said they did not care about that. We left for Shillong the following morning.

While at Shillong in May last, I went to see Father Angelus, superintendent of the Roman Catholic mission at Mary Hill. As soon as he was acquainted that a certain "Babu" came to see him, he at once came out to the veranda. The first question he asked me was, "Are you a Methodist?"

"No, sir," I replied.

"Then are you a Khasi?" (demon-worshipper.)

"No, sir: I am a Unitarian."

Father Angelus.—"How did you come to be acquainted with Unitarianism?"

H. K.—"The Khasi religion recognizes only *One* Supreme Being, and English education and also the Bible have led me to embrace Unitarianism."

F. A.—"Why did you not adopt Methodism?"

H. K.—"Because it teaches that there are three Gods; and I cannot divide my heart, my soul, to three beings. I can devote my soul to One God only."

F. A.—"Who are these three Gods?"

H. K.—"Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

F. A.—"The Holy Trinity?"

H. K.—"Yes, sir."

F. A.—"Don't you believe in Jesus?"

H. K.—"Yes, sir: I do believe in him as a teacher sent by God."

F. A.—"Do you believe that he is the Son of God?"

H. K.—"Yes, sir: I do believe that he is the Son of God. All men are also sons of God: he is pre-eminently the Son of God."

F. A.—"Do you believe in the Bible?"

H. K.—"Yes, as the book written by holy men of God."

F. A.—"If you believe in the Bible, how can you not believe in the Trinity?"

H. K.—"Because there is no such word as "Trinity" in the Bible; and I find nowhere in the Bible that there are *three in One* or *One in three.*"

F. A.—"But you cannot find the word 'Unitarian' in the Bible, neither can you find 'Baptists,' 'Methodists,' 'Roman Catholics' in it. Still, you make use of such words."

H. K.—"The word 'Unitarian' is a name, a designation of a church [I should have said a form of belief]. But it is nowhere said in the Bible that God is *three in One* or *One in three.*

F. A.—"We can infer from the Bible that there are three persons in God,—not *three* Gods, but three *persons.* It is in a philosophical sense, and we cannot explain it. It is a mystery."

H. K.—"Sir, we are but frail human beings, and the creation of God. How can we try to explain his mystery? From the beginning to the end of the Bible it is proclaimed that God is ONE. Why should we say otherwise? We are given to know, and it is all sufficient for us to know, that there is *only one God.* Why should we creatures try to explain the 'persons' in God? Who are we?"

F. A.—"If we do not believe in the Holy Trinity, how can we explain the incarnation? Jesus performed many miracles, which proved that, unless he were God, he could not have performed them."

H. K.—"Jesus did everything by the power of God. He said he could of himself do nothing."

F. A.—"There are many words in the Bible which show that Jesus is God.

Jesus said, 'I and my Father *are* one.' When he was baptized by John in the river 'Yordan' [Jordan], a word from heaven said, 'This is my beloved Son.' These show that he is God. Moreover, he performed miracles which no one could do unless he were God."

H. K.—"As to his saying that he is one with God, we find he prayed that his disciples might also be one with God and himself. As to the voice at his baptism, that rather confirms our faith that Jesus is not God. The 'voice' was like a 'letter of appointment' to Jesus, God declaring him as his Son."

F. A.—"Do you believe, if two or three loads of Bibles were sent to Khasi Hills, with no one to explain its meanings, and with no comments at all, that the readers will become Unitarians?"

H. K.—"Certainly, sir, I do believe so, because the Trinity is not in the Bible."

After some further conversation Father Angelus asked me if there is a European missionary who preaches the Unitarian gospel. I told him there is none. "If so, who preaches the Unitarian religion?" he asked me. I replied at once, "We preach ourselves."

On Sunday, the 13th of May, 1894, I, in company with Robin Roy, attended the morning service of the Roman Catholic Church at Marys Hill. While the services were being conducted by the priest in Latin, which we could not understand, a nun (the mother superior, it was said) read out devotional sentences loudly in Khasi, which were very uplifting, indeed. Some of the Khasi Roman Catholics were served with the Lord's supper: it is called *the mass*, I think. This was the day of Pentecost, it was said. The room in which the services were held was a part of the house in which the priests live. There were many pictures, hung up on the walls, representing the various scenes in the life of Jesus, which pleased me very much, because even illiterate persons can easily learn the life of Jesus from them. There were also large pictures of Jesus and Mary. We remained in the room till the service was over.

On the 14th of May we left Shillong for Cherrapoonjee, distributing tracts and pamphlets on the way, as opportunity offered.

On the 20th I attended the services of the Brahmos at Cherrapoonjee. The services were held in a small room forming part of the mission house. No benches or mats were provided, and we had to sit down on the floor. There were about eighteen persons, including ourselves and some women. The worshippers did not kneel down in prayer or stand up in singing, as we do, but remained sitting throughout the service. The hymns were sung to Bengali tunes. There was no reading or responses. The benediction was simultaneously uttered by all the worshippers, and this was very good indeed. Babu Nilmani Chakravati, the superintendent missionary, was away, attending the anniversaries of some somajes in Bengal, and his duties were being carried on by his Bengali assistant, Babu Ráicharan. The progress of the Brahmo mission has been very slow. I am thinking of conferring with the Brahmo missionary about the best method practicable for the propagation of the faith in *One* true God in these hills.

A party of young men of Cherrapoonjee desired me to go to the house of a friend of theirs to tell them of the Unitarian faith, which I gladly did. I was asked to explain the Unitarian belief about Jesus Christ, Mary, and about pardon, which I did. I explained also our belief regarding the Holy Spirit, and also briefly told them the principles of our faith. I was then asked to explain my opinion about the Khasi religion, which I gladly did; and they seemed much satisfied with my explanations. I remained there till about 9 P.M. I told these friends that Unitarianism is more a life than a belief. They expressed their desire to become well acquainted with our faith; and I distributed Khasi pamphlets to them, and told them to write to me at Jowai for anything they may want to know about the Unitarian faith. In answer to their inquiry I told them that, if necessary, we could send out a preacher to them. We then sang some hymns from our book, and dispersed. Late in the night U Kison Roy, head constable, a member of our Union, having returned from a journey, came to me in my lodging. How happy was the meeting after years of separation! We sat together till about 2 P.M., and conversed about our mission work and its

prospects, and about other things. After prayer, offered by him, we separated. On the following day (24th of May) I went to U Kison Roy's lodging at the police station. He gave me a copy of "The Manual of Drill and Physical Exercises" (Gale & Polden, Chatham, England), for the use of the Unitarian mission schools, which I very gladly accepted. We had a long conversation about religious life. I explained to him our position as Unitarians in these hills, our duty to keep ourselves as blameless as possible, and our duty to do all we can for the diffusion of our gospel among our people. After prayer we left for the Cherra village.

On my way back to Shillong from Cherrapoonjee I passed through Máwphlang, and called at the house of Babu Doisingh, a Post-office Mission correspondent. Not finding him at home, I left a new Khasi leaflet (No. 2) for him in his house, and resumed my journey.

HAJOM KISSOR SINGH.

Jowai, Khasi Hills, Nov. 13, 1894.

ONE OF OUR CHURCHES.

This church formed its independent organization for the express purpose of putting behind it all that impedes, all that limits and narrows and separates and creates discord and conflicts, and pushing on to the things that are before,—the things toward which the best men and women aspire, the holy things of life, the things set forth in the example and by the teaching of Jesus Christ.

This church has, therefore, no creed. It has no test of compulsory belief. Its members belong together, not because they have given up thinking for themselves and all agreed to accept one statement of faith, but because they have a common purpose. They unite to worship together; to seek divine guidance, strength, and help together, that they may grow each and all more and more into Christ-like life.

More than anything else this may be said to be a church of the living God. For it is the divine *presence*, God with us here, giving whenever we ask, revealing himself wherever we seek, answering whenever we knock, upon which this church relies. That is its height. Its breadth is the world. Its depth is unknown, for it has never touched bottom. It has never found a human being whom it would not welcome as a child of God, and therefore a brother.

It has a large and flourishing Sunday-school, in which it tries to touch its boys and girls with the strong, pure, loving spirit of Jesus Christ, so that they shall feel that to be true to every duty, faithful to the voice of conscience, and lovingly glad to help on the world in its battle of life, is the best way to serve God.

There are many organizations within the church for missionary, charitable, educational, and other purposes. The society has always been noted for a loving spirit of harmony within itself, as well as for social friendliness and hospitality; but I shrink from cataloguing our personal virtues, as I certainly shall make no public parade of our many shortcomings. Our confessional is with God!

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Unitarian:—

Mr. Fenn, with his "New Year's Greeting," made a point that his brother preachers would do well to heed. For fear it may pass unnoticed, I beg leave to call their attention to what I have long felt was a great and uncultivated field. Among other good things, he said: "My New Year's word of good cheer is that the Unitarian laymen are beginning to give more of themselves to the actual religious work." Why has it previously been otherwise? And why does it require quite a stretch of imagination to see much improvement now? Is it not because the pulpit has been firing essays at the pews instead of going down to them, and finding out their needs and ministering thereto? Have the ministers in general been trying to bring out and develop the laymen, or have they spent their time in preaching *at them?* Are the ministers constantly recognizing the good in their members and helping them to develop it, or are they using the pulpit as a sort of force-pump to fill up the members? How many ministers are prepared each Sunday as they go into their pulpits to give that which the multitude needs, that which can come only from contact with the world? The minister may have a good moral essay,

but perhaps that is not as good as the layman has read in some periodical during the week. Preachers are rare indeed whose eloquence alone can hold their audiences. The average layman, although he can but poorly express himself, often has the word the congregation needs. Who, then, aside from the few born orators, can hope to reach the people, except as they listen to and minister to the pews? The strongest Unitarian church in Iowa (the Sioux City church) is a notable example of this kind of work. I also call to mind another Iowa church, with a usually small congregation, that has recently tried the experiment of hearing from the congregation Sunday evenings, which resulted in filling the church. A very brilliant woman, who is being constantly asked to speak, and who is always in demand when something is to be said in public, recently told me she had received some good advice which she was going to profit by. A friend had said to her: "Don't you think you are talking too much? You will get common." Of course, this would not apply to Unitarian ministers. I would, however, suggest that in your conventions, your conferences, and whenever possible, you cease doing *all* the talking, and occasionally call on the laymen. You can learn from them. You will better know their trials and victories in actual life. You may receive some "applied Christianity" that will do your souls good. You will certainly get better business methods into your work. But, more particularly in your own parish, if you will *cultivate* the laymen, you will have laymen to help carry on your work. Then will the laymen bear more resemblance to the minister, and the minister bear less resemblance to the priest.

H. B. HAWLEY.

Des Moines, Ia.

Love the beautiful,
Seek out the true,
Wish for the good,
And the best do!

—*From Mendelssohn.*

A leaf may hide the largest star
From love's uplifted eye;
A mote of prejudice out-bar
A world of charity.

—*John B. Tabb.*

ONE UPWARD LOOK EACH DAY.

SELECTED FROM "HYMNS AND VERSES," BY SAMUEL LONGFELLOW.

SUNDAY.

We sowed a seed in faith and hope
Out in the unfenced lands:
Now rooted deep and spreading fair,
A living tree it stands.
Nor strife nor cry has marked its growth;
But, broad'ning silently,
Each bough that sways in sunshine says,
The truth shall make you free.

From outward rule to inward law
That truth our feet still lead!
From letter into spirit still,
From form to life and deed!
From God afar to God most near,
Our confidence is he.
From fear of man or church's ban
His truth has made us free.

MONDAY.

New year! new life, new love,
New hope's fair prophecy;
New earth around, new heavens above,
Veiled in soft mystery!

O deep and boundless love!
O life, more full and free!
O hopes, in fairer colors wove!
This new year's gift are ye.

TUESDAY.

'Tis winter now; the fallen snow
Has left the heavens all coldly clear;
Through leafless boughs the sharp winds blow,
And all the earth lies dead and drear.

And yet God's love is not withdrawn;
His life within the keen air breathes,
His beauty paints the crimson dawn,
And clothes the boughs with glitt'ring wreaths.

WEDNESDAY.

From hand to hand the greeting flows,
From eye to eye the signals run,
From heart to heart the bright hope glows;
The seekers of the light are one—

One in the freedom of the truth,
One in the joys of paths untrod,
One in the soul's perennial youth,
One in the larger thought of God—

The freer step, the fuller breath,
The wide horizon's grander view,
The sense of life that knows no death,—
The life that maketh all things new.

THURSDAY.

O God, thou giver of all good!
Thy children live by daily food;
And daily must the prayer be said,
Give us this day our daily bread!

The life of earth and seed is thine;
Suns glow, rains fall, by power divine;
Thou art in all; not even the powers
By which we toil for bread are ours.

Since every day by thee we live,
May grateful hearts thy gifts receive,
And may the hands be pure from stain
With which our daily bread we gain!

FRIDAY.

Where violets cast their shadow on the sod,
The dewy grass in cooler freshness starts;
And so, beneath the shadowing hand of God,
Spring fresh the holier feelings of our hearts.
The Almighty's shadow is a star-lit night:
His cloud is ever full of hidden light.

SATURDAY.

Father, give thy benediction,
Give thy peace before we part;
Still our minds with truth's conviction,
Calm with trust each anxious heart;
Let thy voice, with sweet commanding,
Bid our griefs and struggles end;
Peace which passeth understanding
On our waiting spirits send.

"ONE SPLENDID FIDELITY."—Jesus Christ says he is not come to destroy man's life, but to increase it; and man, by absorbing truth, crowds out error. God would not send a man off by himself or into a cloister to seek the truth, but would bring him into closer association and communication with himself. This is making man more complete, and not less complete. It is making him better fitted for the cares and duties of life. I don't wonder that men shrink from religion when they are led to believe that they are to be less useful in this life. There is much in the Old Testament that they cannot take into their lives; but the New Testament stands at the very threshold of life, and tells them that there is only one life in the universe. Not one life here, and another there, with different kinds of fidelity. The whole great world lives by one splendid fidelity, and that fidelity is God. The truth lives, the institutions live, and man lives, because from God comes all power.— *Bishop Phillips Brooks.*

EDITORIAL.

Small Seed. A CORRESPONDENT in Manchester, N.H, writes: "My wish is to help spread our faith. The need is so great, the money so little! But a small seed rightly placed may bear fruit. I should like the $10.00 (enclosed) used to give that excellent magazine, the *Unitarian*, to a few more people." We gratefully thank our generous correspondent; and, while we may perhaps confess to some prejudice toward this particular method of missionary work, yet we desire to call the attention of others to the condensed wisdom of the few words we have quoted. They are an epitome of that union of religious thinking and practice which we so often hear commended, and which we rejoice to see so often realized among the people of our own denomination. First, the earnest desire to share with others all the spiritual blessing, help, and inspiration of our own inheritance. Next, a clear and deepening sense of how great a need this is, and of what a responsibility the recognition puts upon us. Lastly, and here, perhaps, more than anywhere, is there something still to be learned by the least of us, "a small seed rightly placed may bear fruit"; the gift of what we can, the personal contribution of something from our own store, however small,—"a small seed rightly placed."

Love Offerings. WHEN people leave money to their minister or to some of the interests of their church or religious denomination, we feel that it is the expression of a deep sentiment of the heart. It is always a pleasure to record such offerings, not only for the sake of the gifts themselves, but even more for the purpose they declare. It is the spirit of disinterested affection, of loyal love centring about the noble ideals of a common cause, that testifies to genuine faith. The will of Mr. George M. Stearns, just probated, shows a gift of $1,000 to the Unitarian church of Pembroke, Mass., $2,000 to the Unitarian church of Rowe, Mass., and $6,000 to the Unitarian church of Chicopee, Mass. By the will of Mr. Ira P. Farrington of Portland, Me., the American Unitarian Association receives the gift of $20,000, which is to be used through the loan fund for church building.

Mr. Farrington also leaves the sum of $21,000 to the Preble Chapel Institution for the Ministry at Large of Portland, Me. It would be well for all if the same spirit that prompted these generous gifts prevailed, in proportion to means, with every Unitarian householder throughout the whole body of our denomination. Why should not every man and woman of our faith have upon his or her will, as a love offering, the name of some Unitarian church? It should not be left to the large donors to keep this privilege to themselves. What church would not be touched with responsive sentiment when it learned that its humblest member had left to the Sunday-school library even the mite that remained? There are so many little ways in which an earnest church can extend its helpful work if it has a little sum of small gifts from which to derive an extra income. How useful, however small, is a permanent fund for emergencies in charitable work, or for purchasing the ever-needed supply of new books for the minister, who is rarely able to buy what he knows he ought to have; or for meeting the steadily recurring necessity of church repairs; or a music fund that should secure just that extra help that makes a choir strong; or a fund for special services, something by which the extra charges which such services entail could be met? Such funds would begin their usefulness from the first $100 given, and the smallest offering of love would by example create more love to make more offerings.

From Far Away. A PERSONAL letter received from that devoted native missionary in the Khasi Hills of India, Hajom Kissor Singh, is so full of the incident and simplicity of primitive evangelism that we print it fully in another column, under the title of "An Apostle in India." We commend it to our readers. It is realism at its best, for it clothes an ideal spirit. In a setting of strange freshness and local vividness it portrays with uncommon simplicity a daily life of gospel bearing. Almost the same mail brought us from New Zealand a small manuscript which proved to be an original hymn from Rev. J. Edwards, a Methodist minister in Reefton, the printing of which we reluctantly postpone for lack of space. It breathes the spirit of devotion common to all real faith, and touches the essence of religious philosophy in its closing couplet:—

"So full my heart of life and love divine,
My Father, thus I know that thou art mine."

Church Services. AN increasing interest in the enrichment of our usually severely simple services is shown by the formation of an organization to be known as the "Order for the Enrichment of Church Services." This society originates with the Meadville Theological School students, and through its secretary, R. S. Loring, is seeking to interest all who could be influential in introducing more beautiful services or better music or nobler ideals of church architecture. There is little doubt that in all these directions most of our churches might be improved. A study of the needs of the people, especially the younger members, a comparison of our own services with those of other religious denominations, and a free discussion of such subjects in our conferences, guilds, and unity clubs, will no doubt lead to a healthy development of our services without detracting from the earnestness, seriousness, or spiritual energy which alone lifts any service above perfunctoriness.

Modern Manhood. IT was one thing for Abraham to walk with God as he roamed the grassy plains of the Euphrates valley, with his little band of dependants, their families, slaves, and cattle; and it is certainly quite another thing for the modern man to walk with God, among his fifty or a hundred thousand neighbors in one city. The same plane of moral life, the same system and laws of conduct, are no longer adequate. With immensely extended sphere, with marvellously improved facilities, it is clear that there should go a larger and nobler conception of manhood. But the industrial, material change has come about so rapidly, and with such absorbing interest, that the development of the high qualities of manhood has hardly kept pace with it. Is not this the moral and religious crisis which confronts our age? The old level of manhood is not high enough to meet the new demands. It was possible once to almost idolize a Goliath or even a Nero: it is now time to believe that even

Jesus the Christ was not too perfect a figure to be simply human.

Head *v.* Heart. While a steady stream of ministers from other denominations flows far more readily into our Unitarian field than we can provide channels in which to set them to work, it is exceedingly unusual to find any one of these ministers returning to the fold he has once forsaken. We have before us, however, a rather amusing case which occurred in San José, Cal. Two years ago Rev. J. H. Garnett, pastor of the First Baptist Church of San José, startled his people by avowing his heterodoxy. That he might be "thoroughly loyal to conscience and conviction," he withdrew from the Baptist church and became associate pastor with Rev. N. A. Haskell of the First Unitarian Church in the same city. After Mr. Haskell's removal to Denver Mr. Garnett was chosen pastor, in which capacity he served for eighteen months, when he resigned, with the extraordinary statement that, while his head was a good Unitarian, his heart refused to come over, and compelled him to return to the Baptist church. Hardness of heart is an old enemy to truth since the days when Moses pleaded before Pharaoh; but, when the light of the new revelation once shines in a man's brain, the usual result has been to enable him to stand firmly with truth and God, as Jesus did, no matter what pangs the heart must bear, and it would seem that Mr. Garnett has very decidedly failed to grasp the fundamental principle of unity, in allowing himself to be thus made twain.

Saved. A paragraph in the newspapers records an event which suggests an interesting question in Christian philosophy.

At a little station on one of our railroads the New York express was in sight, close at hand, coming on at forty miles an hour. The people on the station platform were hurrying under shelter to escape the dust, when a young man noticed that for some unaccountable reason the switch was not properly set. If the express reached it, the entire train would be turned into a siding, and hurled down an enbankment. He made up his mind, leaped on to the track, unlocked the switch, and had just time to pull it into the right position, when the locomotive struck him, flinging him thirty feet away, while the cars passed on in safety. The hero was picked up terribly shattered, but not killed. He was carried to the hospital, and recovered.

As the New Testament teaches that any one who shall lose his life for Christ's sake and the gospel's shall save it, what really happened to the young man? He surrendered himself for love of God and his fellow-men. Did he, in this giving up of his own life, in truth, save it; that is, receive it back with an added quality of salvation in it? Was his spiritual and moral nature changed, so that thereafter it was capable of achievements which would have been impossible to it before?

To the objection that those who came in contact with him subsequently could see no change, it should be remembered how often the brothers, sisters, and parents of men of genius have failed to discern any unusual presence among them. It should not, therefore, be surprising if this subtile readjustment of the inward springs of being goes undetected.

A Woman's Bible. Mrs. Josephine Butler has been interviewed in the *Humanitarian* with regard to the fact that so many of the advanced advocates of the enfranchisement of women have found themselves in antagonism to Christian teaching on account of certain texts in the Bible. Herself a devout woman, reared within the pale of the Church, Mrs. Butler does not for a moment admit that the Bible is really against women's rights: she holds that its apparent antagonism is due to inaccurate translation and a mistaken view of the inspiration of the church councils. She would remedy these defects in two ways: first, by revising the "Revised Version" by the aid of trained women commentators; and, second, she would have women brought in to revise the judgment of those males who, in times past, decided what books were canonical and what were not.

As an instance of the way in which women commentators will deal with the Scriptures, Mrs. Butler says:—

"It is full time that women should become profound students of Scripture, accomplished Hebrew and Greek scholars, and versed in

the principles of true criticism. . . . I have always felt astonished that respectable and reverent men should have so long allowed a hazy translation of certain expressions of Saint Paul to pass as quite authoritative, and so influence in a very important direction the whole of human rules and conduct. The apostle says, 'It is a shame for women to speak in the church,' and this has been enforced in its literal sense by a large body of ecclesiastics.

"Judge the surprise of a modern intelligent woman, when, in looking up the word rendered 'speak,' in Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon—of which no one will dispute the authority—she finds it translated 'to chatter like monkeys, to twitter like birds'!"

But this is not the only way in which Mrs. Butler would restore the balance: she would, in the second place, revise the canon, including books now kept outside the covers of the Bible. She says:—

"While I believe in a large sense in the inspiration of the Scriptures, I do not believe in the direct inspiration of the council of men who decided as to what should be canonical."

Mrs. Butler would include the story of Susannah, which, she maintains, was declared apocryphal merely from prejudice, because it showed the character of woman in a more favorable light than that of man. She says:—

"The exclusion of the book of Judith is another instance of male prejudice. It is a beautiful epic poem. Every time I read it I feel more in love with the beautiful heroine. Where can we find a more splendid example of woman's patriotism and wisdom?

"Take yet another instance where masculine bias is equally visible,—the exclusion of the second book of Esther from the canon. The first book of Esther, in which the heroine seems in every way subservient to the king, living only to give him pleasure, abasing herself at his feet, and trembling at approaching his presence,—this is pronounced canonical.

"Doubtless the learned council thought it an admirable example to set before women; but, when they came to study the second book of Esther, in which the soul of the woman rises in revolt against the drunken and licentious monarch who owns her as his chattel, they shake their heads in doubt.

"That part of the story must be apocryphal; and so we have that prayer of Queen Esther for herself and her people, one of the most beautiful outpourings of a woman's heart ever penned, excluded from the Scriptures."

Mr. Moody's Eloquence.

Prof. Henry Drummond, writing in *McClure's Magazine* for December, says of Mr. Moody's preaching:—

If eloquence is measured by its effects upon an audience, and not by its balanced sentences and cumulative periods, then here is eloquence of the highest order. In sheer persuasiveness Mr. Moody has few equals; and, rugged as his preaching may seem to some, there is in it a pathos of a quality which few orators have ever reached, an appealing tenderness which not only wholly redeems it, but raises it not unseldom almost to sublimity.

No report can do the faintest justice to this or to the other most characteristic qualities of his public speech, but here is a random specimen:—

"I can imagine when Christ said to the little band around him, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel,' Peter said, 'Lord, do you really mean that we are to go back to Jerusalem and preach the gospel to those men that murdered you?'

"'Yes,' said Christ, 'go hunt up that man that spat in my face: tell him that he may have a seat in my kingdom yet. Yes, Peter, go find that man that made that cruel crown of thorns, and placed it on my brow, and tell him I will have a crown ready for him when he comes into my kingdom, and there will be no thorns in it. Hunt up that man that took a reed and brought it down over the cruel thorns, driving them into my brow, and tell him I will put a sceptre into his hand, and he shall rule over the nations of the earth if he will accept salvation. Search for the man that drove the spear into my side, and tell him there is a nearer way to my heart than that.'"

"Tell him there is a nearer way to my heart than that,"—prepared or impromptu, what dramatist could surpass the touch?

It is not true that love makes all things easy: it makes us choose what is difficult. *George Eliot.*

Departments.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

Our churches have drifted into a habit of postponing the contributions for the American Unitarian Association to the end of the financial year, in April. For instance, in 1894 fourteen churches contributed in January about $2,500; in February, eighteen churches, about $4,000; in March, sixty-one churches, about $8,000; in April, one hundred and sixty-three churches, about $28,000. There is a reason for this besides procrastination. But, if the contributions could be moved forward a month or two, it would be probably just as well for the churches and much better for the American Unitarian Association. During the present year the contributions have increased at the rate, on an average, of about 33 per cent. If this rate of increase is carried through, all the contributions to come before the first of May, it will amount to about $17,000 more than the contributions of last year. This, however, is less than half of the sum needed to carry the work on with due regard to obligations already incurred.

It is possible that some new arrangement may be made with the government after July, which will change the conditions for carrying on our Indian School in Montana. But, whatever changes are made, our contract with the teachers runs until July; and the usual contributions are needed more than ever, so that we may come to the end of the year without debt.

The mission in Japan is now well housed, better equipped than ever; and the appropriations for the current year will be much reduced. The income of the Heywood Fund, amounting to about $1,200, must be appropriated to foreign missions.

On the Pacific Coast there has been such a financial depression that all institutions dependent on the good will of the public have suffered. Churches that in ordinary times would have become self-supporting have, without any fault of their own, lost half their income. But the vitality of our movement in that part of the country is such that, with the revival of business, a new era of prosperity will set in, and our work have large expansion. If the Association could take advantage of the bargains in church property offered to us in communities where Unitarian churches might easily be organized, investments might now be made so that $20,000 would go as far as $100,000 in ordinary times.

At Helena, Mont., political and financial disturbances are passing; and our church stands ready to take a commanding position. Among the Scandinavians of the North-west a little work is going on, which might become a large one. For lack of means, it will not be extended; but Unitarians may take satisfaction in the knowledge that a few thousand Scandinavians are assisted to become American citizens of the better class. Among the Germans there are many signs of desire to come into relations with the Unitarian Church of America, and a movement in that direction will soon be recorded. Disaster has swept the whole length of the Mississippi valley. Churches and ministers that have suffered do not like to be called by name, and yet there are cases which excite the most active sympathy of those who know the details of distress and disappointment.

In the South conditions are now favorable for a large increase of interest. Cultivated men and women, Southern born and bred, are beginning to move out of their old church home. With the new enterprises come new ideas. From Southern people who have never had relations with Northern Unitarianism now come assurances that, if a few solid and self-supporting churches could be established in Southern cities, as examples, they would speedily become centres of influence. It is believed that by another year our church at Atlanta can realize on the investment of money made there for a small beginning, move into larger quarters, and thenceforth become independent. The reasonable hope that the church at Chattanooga would by this time have become self-supporting has been frustrated; but the financial distress will not continue, and the hope will yet be realized. Meanwhile the call is urgent. In Memphis a new church has been assisted, in the expectation that it will speedily become self-supporting.

In the Middle States the conditions have been more favorable in every way. Progress has been somewhat impeded, but no disasters are to be reported. The most critical point is at Ithaca, where the building of a new church created a debt, in part because the salable property of the church suddenly lost its value. The churches of the Middle States will, it is hoped, lift the burden.

In New England we find ample missionary ground. Connecticut is becoming liberal. The demand from New Haven for the establishment there of a Unitarian church sufficiently equipped to attract the attention of the university cannot long be disregarded. It is believed that a large family church could be established there which would realize the expectations excited when the National Conference demanded that the Unitarian Association should establish churches in the principal college towns and State capitals. The aid given to old churches in New England has been reduced to a total of about $3,000.

Next month the directors of the American Unitarian Association will receive the report of the Committee on Reorganization, and make recommendations to be acted upon at the annual meeting. For constitu-

tional reasons it will probably be impossible to have the services of a financial officer in the field for the next three months. All the more it is desirable that every superintendent, secretary, minister, church, and conference should become an active agent to increase the resources of the American Unitarian Association. If it can come to the annual meeting without a deficit, keeping faith meanwhile with those to whom it is bound in honor, the beginning of a new era may be expected. The policy of the American Unitarian Association is retrenchment in all possible directions; the weeding out of all unprofitable enterprises; the consolidation of the work of church extension; and then, according to the liberality of its constituency, quick expansion in new enterprises, along the lines of least resistance, in the spread of the principles for the maintenance of which the Association exists.

GEORGE BATCHELOR.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

The following paragraph from a contemporary shows clearly that Sunday-school interests are being cared for more thoroughly than heretofore. What Unitarian society would do as much as this? And yet what we believe requires even more careful teaching than ordinary doctrines. To effect this early education, we ought to have the adequate appointments. There is an improvement in many directions in our own denomination, seen in the modern vestries, which are not now always placed in subterranean regions. Many of the recent edifices built by our Unitarian parishes provide fit accommodations above ground for Sunday-school use, full of light and healthful air. But the fact stated below is quite significant:—

"William Reynolds declares that the new Sunday-school house of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., is a step beyond anything yet in the completeness of its Sunday-school appointments. It cost about $100,000."

A bright writer on Sunday-school subjects has a word to say about the comparative claims of the church and the Sunday-school on the child, as follows: "In a recent book on work in the Sunday-school for those in the primary grade it is said: 'It is more important that children go to church than to Sunday-school: the former is an institution of God, the latter of man.' We do not wish in the least to minimize the importance of having the child attend the services of the church; but the fact is that statement is untrue, and untrue in about all of its particulars. In the first place, the services of the church are not the church itself. While the church was instituted by God, the preaching service, as we have it, was instituted by man. In the second place, the Sunday-school is a part of the church, and therefore is not to be discriminated against in this way. In the third place, the teaching service which we now call Sunday-school was ordained of God before preaching came into vogue. Jesus himself was more a teacher than a preacher. He 'taught' the multitudes. In the fourth place, it is not as well for the little child, if a choice *must* be made, to attend the preaching services as to be present at the teaching services of the church. There are cogent reasons for his going to church, if it be possible for him to go; but, in our desire to exalt the church, do not let us part company with common sense. That tells us that he will be more benefited by coming to a table where he can help himself than to one which is spread almost solely for older people." It is not likely that the majority of our Unitarian ministers would agree with the last part of the quotation above. We are accustomed to say that, if an alternative is presented and must be taken, then it is better for a child to go to church rather than to the Sunday-school. My own position is that both can be attended. There is a great deal to be said in favor of the child's going to the Sunday-school in any case, provided the school in question is well equipped for teaching, well conducted, cheerful, and reverent. In such a case it is a church, for the time being, to the child; and preachers are well aware that it is about hopeless to satisfy the very young and the mature in a sermon. However, I am starting a subject which always arouses discussion, when I simply wished to call attention to the views of a Trinitarian writer.

The New Song and Service Book, which has been in preparation some time by the Unitarian Sunday School Society, will be published, probably, about the end of March. All the matter is in the printers' hands. There will be ten general services, carefully fashioned on a basis of comparison with old and new forms. They will incorporate those features which have tended the most to make past services acceptable both in the music and the responsive readings. There will be in these special services one on "Patriotism," "Temperance," "Christening," "Anniversary," "In Memoriam," "Commemoration," as well as the customary ones for Christmas, Easter, Floral, and Harvest. A sufficient number of carols and appropriate tunes have been included in the book to meet the wants of those who wish a special service on these festival days, so that it will not be necessary for those having the book to secure any outside material. In addition to these twenty services there will be about two hundred hymns and tunes. These are of a fourfold character,—valuable old tunes and carols now liked by our Sunday-schools, attractive new tunes from other denominations not known to our Sunday-schools,

original music composed expressly for this book, and also the standard congregational tunes and psalms which ought to be well known both in Sunday-school and church. The aim has been to prepare a book which, while maintaining a high standard both in the services and the music, will prove available and helpful to the average Unitarian Sunday-school. It is intended, if possible, that the book shall sell at 25 cents a copy or $3 a dozen. I make this announcement at this time and in this way because so many schools have been waiting for the book, and it is right that they should know now the definite time of publication.

I made a canvass lately of twenty Unitarian Sunday-schools, to ascertain if the offering of rewards and prizes was carried to any great extent, at the same time asking for opinions. I will not quote the names of my correspondents, who very promptly responded; but I can give the general tenor of their answers. It seems that the most that is done in our schools is often the giving of a reward for attendance,—generally a book; sometimes, a recognition of classes giving the largest contributions; here and there, a roll of honor with regard to perfect attendance. There is absolutely nothing beyond this feature, and even this does not prevail to any great extent. With regard to the prize system as a whole there is a division of opinion. One clergyman in the Middle West says, "I distrust competitive prizes." Another minister in Boston replies: "My opinion is that the whole visible plan of creation goes by rewards. The only question seems to be of arrangement and adjustment to the infinitely varied personal preference." And another declares that it is pernicious, adding, "Nothing wrecks character sooner than to pay people to be good." Yet a brother clergyman of equally good judgment and standing, with a large experience, says, "It is not the highest motive, but it works in the right direction." A superintendent of one of our largest Sunday-schools replies: "I believe in rewards and prizes in moderation. Even if the scholar has the prize in mind, he cannot help absorbing something of value." While, on the other hand, another correspondent emphatically declares: "I would give nothing of the kind. It destroys the true motive in church work and influence." The facts are that many of these brethren who report a theoretical approval of the prize system do not have anything of the kind in their own schools. On the whole, it is better to depend as little as possible on this inferior and dangerous motive.

The current leaflet lessons on the "Life of Jesus" in the one-topic graded system are now out for February, the subjects being: "The Parable of the Sower," "Jesus sending out his Disciples to preach," "Jesus at the Pool of Bethesda," "Death of John the Baptist." The Intermediate are prepared by Rev. Edward A. Horton, and the Advanced by Rev. W. Hanson Pulsford. They are printed together in one leaflet. Price, 50 cents per hundred. EDWARD A. HORTON.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN.

It is a matter of congratulation that so many new Branches of this national organization are being formed. Since the Conference at Saratoga a new interest has been shown in the work; and Branches in Lebanon and Wilton, N.H., Brattleboro, Vt., Buffalo, N.Y., Memphis, Tenn., Barnstable, Charlestown, Neponset, and West Roxbury, Mass., have been organized and welcomed. Besides these single Branches, the Compound Branch, including the women's societies of twelve churches on the Pacific Coast and another at Greenfield, Mass., taking all the societies in Franklin County, have brought many members to the Alliance.

The difference between an Associate Branch and a Compound Branch is not always well understood. An Associate Branch is a union of two or more Branches for more effective work. The largest Associate Branch is the one including the New England Branches, each an organization in its own church. A Compound Branch is not a union of Branches, but a union of women from several societies, making one Branch. Such is the Philadelphia Branch, composed of women from the two churches in Philadelphia, the Germantown, Wilmington, Camden, and Vineland churches.

The Executive Board of the Alliance holds monthly meetings at 25 Beacon Street, Boston, in the Unitarian Association Building, and keeps fully in touch with all the activities of the Branches by receiving monthly reports through the directors and vice-presidents. The Branches in turn receive monthly reports of what is done at the board meetings in the way of suggestion and recommendation as to the best methods of carrying on the different parts of the work.

A Committee on Study Classes has prepared several courses of study, and leaflets with suitable topics for discussion classified and arranged. Most of the Branches undertake some work of this kind, with the most agreeable and profitable results.

At the last monthly meeting, which occurred on January 11, it was the turn of the Branches in New York and the other Middle States, with the Middle West and the South, to send in reports. A few extracts from the condensed reports of the vice-presidents may be of interest.

At the Church of the Messiah, New York, the Benevolent Society and the Alliance have united, having the same president, but

different secretaries. Lenox Avenue meets monthly, and has a printed programme covering an interesting variety of subjects. Recently a Religious News Committee has been appointed, which gives at each meeting a summary of our own denominational affairs, and also of what occurs in other denominations. In many of the Alliance Branches this "Committee on Religious Intelligence" is one of the chief interests of the monthly meetings.

The study class at the Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn, is reading O. B. Frothingham's "Boston Unitarianism." Unity Church has a study class with forty-eight members, following the course of the Alliance Leaflet No. 1.; while at Yonkers the study class is under the direction of Dr. Bixby. At Newburg the Branch is managed by four standing committees; namely, "Visiting, Work, Social, and Study."

Meadville is active in many directions, and expects to accomplish a great deal in Post-office Mission work, in co-operation with the Philadelphia Branch.

Like many other Branches, the one in Cincinnati has held a very successful fair, and promises to have a profitable winter.

The Branch at Hamilton, Ont., Canada, needs encouragement and help. The church has lost heavily by death of members, and the continued depression of the times has almost paralyzed their efforts. The whole congregation meet each week at the house of some member to study Emerson; and another meeting is held after the Sunday evening services, where papers on religious and social topics are read, followed by discussion.

At Syracuse the Alliance is the centre of all the women's work in the church, six standing committees caring for the different sections. The Beneficence Committee will devote its energies to raising money for Ithaca: the Post-office Mission Committee will publish and distribute Mr. Calthrop's sermons.

The "fellowship," which is such a prominent part of all Alliance work, and which is very fully developed in the national organization, has been shown during the last few months by the interchange of articles for sales. It has been proved the most profitable and easiest way of filling treasuries to "hold a fair or sale," and Branches have materially helped each other by contributions for such fairs. Especially in the South have such gifts been appreciated. The following is the report from Greenville, S.C.: "This Branch is full of enthusiasm at the success of its recent fair or apron sale. Nothing of the kind was ever before attempted by the members, and friends in the other Branches were very kind. There were no expenses for hall, advertisement, etc., so that everything that came in was clear gain; and they have, as a result, a hundred dollars toward the Library Building. This building will give them room for the Sunday meetings of the Unity Circle. Rev. Mr. Westall of Asheville recently preached here. The circle engaged the opera house, and gave due notice of the event; and a hundred and fifty were present. The Circle holds Sunday services regularly at Mrs. Putnam's house, and finds the Sunday-school lessons very useful."

The Christmas sale recently held by the Chattanooga Branch brought the people together very delightfully. Rev. Mr. Free constructed a pretty booth for the ladies in their parlor at the church. Here the fancy articles were displayed. There were also an apron table and a candy and chocolate table; and a supper was served. At the sociable, a week after the sale, the remainder of the articles were disposed of; and, altogether, $78 was realized. A little money was left in the Branch treasury from last year, and at the next meeting the hundred dollars promised last fall will be handed to the church treasurer.

The Branch at Richmond, Va., reports that its monthly meetings are full of interest. Some religious reading is taken up, and details of church work are considered. The members decorated the hall where services are held modestly but tastefully for Christmas, and provide a few flowers for the desk every Sunday, which are afterward sent to those who are ill or absent. This little attention is much appreciated. A free circulating library of fifty volumes has recently been provided with a suitable case by a member of the Young Men's Liberal Church League, and catalogued by the Branch; and the books—almost entirely religious—are in demand. Contributions of books for that library will be gratefully received at 611 East Franklin Street. The Branch has organized a Choral Society, which meets every Tuesday to practise the hymns for the following Sunday, the music being entirely congregational, and without any expense whatever to the church. The fortnightly meetings of the Art and Literature Circle are well attended, and full of interest and profit. Small contributions were sent by members of the Branch to the recent fairs at Austin, Chattanooga, and Greenville.

EMILY A. FIFIELD.

NEW YORK LEAGUE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN.—The second meeting of the season of the New York League of Unitarian Women was held at the Second Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, Dec. 7, 1894.

Mrs. Bishopric read the Religious News Report, giving an account of the Middle States Conference at Baltimore.

Mrs. Smiley, of the Philanthropic Committee, gave some suggestions about the wisest way to help the homeless and destitute.

An appeal for help for the Ithaca church

was made by Mrs. Dix, and a collection was taken. Fifty-two dollars were contributed.

The President, Mrs. Hooper, in introducing the topic for the day, "Toleration," thought that this hospitality of opinion should be cultivated. Intolerance and harsh criticism stood in the way of progress. She introduced Mrs. Percival Chubb, who considered the subject in reference to art, music, and literature.

Mrs. Chubb said that in all discussion in fine art to-day we lack a standard of toleration.

True toleration implies a standard of valuation, which in turn depends upon a coherent view of the world. In literature and art the average person of culture has no standard of valuation. He lives by taste, and not by reason and principle; and to him the question of toleration does not arise.

Formerly the ethical was the only point of view from which art products were regarded, and valuation was comparatively simple. Now we are taught that subject-matter is nothing, and treatment everything.

We shall not reduce this nebulous condition of our minds until we hold, not a rule of thumb, but a philosophy of life, a world view to which to relate the facts of experience and give them their place in the scale of value.

Toleration is not a virtue of the heart, but rather an intellectual virtue, based upon breadth of comprehension, width of outlook.

The question of toleration in social life was spoken of by Mrs. Jerome Plummer. From her wide experience she felt that in social life we must grant the right of every individual to his own opinion. We know so little of the inner life of people, what right has one to judge, to criticise?

Toleration in religion was considered by Mrs. Edward Rawlston. In a brief historical *résumé* she showed the growth of tolerance in the Christian Church, marked by famous decrees.

Mrs. Rawlston agreed with him who said, A man's belief is his own, his life is the whole world's. Tolerance although a fundamental Christian right, is often wanting, even in men who have thought toward those who have not, among the young toward their elders.

Mrs. Van Everen spoke of the effect of creeds, accustoming those who lean on them to feel nearer to those who agreed with them, but intolerant to those outside of their fold.

Mrs. Miller had a few thoughts to add to the subject. She said, in general, toleration referred to the spirit, and tolerance to the life. In the clubs for women of every belief, banded together on some broad platform, we find a great factor for inculcating tolerance. We see the results: women are everywhere becoming more tolerant. Human motive is hard to understand: we must hold our judgment in reserve.

Mrs. Dix referred to the unusual sight, namely, of a Catholic clergyman speaking on a Unitarian platform at Saratoga this fall.

After a hymn and the Lord's Prayer the meeting adjourned.

ALICE P. JACKSON, *Rec. Sec'y.*

GUILDS.

It is reported that the society at Somerville, Mass., enters upon its second year "with large numbers and great hopefulness." The corresponding secretary, of the Alliance, Miss Kate L. Brown, made two visits to this organization in the fall, the first time giving an address on "The Work and Aims of the True Guild." Later Rev. Mary T. Whitney went over to one of the meetings, taking a delegation of young people from West Somerville, where she hopes some time to organize a guild.

In South Natick, Mass., the guild uses Mrs. Susan H. Nixon's book on "Right Living." Discussions are held every Sunday evening, a chapter first having been read.

A report comes from a society in Malden, Mass., which has just rounded a year's existence. The age of the members averages lower than in most of our organizations, including some from the primary classes in the Sunday-school, and various ages up to sixteen. It is difficult to get the best results without some who are considerably older. The attendance has been very good. The conduct of the meeting has involved a service from the Sunday-school book, some music, and a paper, original or selected. Texts and quotations follow. Three ladies have formed a Committee on Programmes, and one of them has had supervision of each meeting. Among the subjects considered are "Reverence," "Kindness," "Honor," "Patriotism," "Our Neighbor." The meetings are held fortnightly. Would that the young people would rally to the helpful opportunity of this guild!

In the January *Open Church* we find two articles on matters pertinent to our columns. Miss Kate L. Brown writes on "How to make the Guild a Success," and Mr. Warren A. Rodman discusses "The Aims of the Guild." The editor reports the union conference held in Channing Hall December 5 "a decided success in its spirit and in the character of the papers and addresses, though the attendance was not large." A meeting of like character was voted to be held about March 1.

From the Second Church, Athol, Mass., comes the word that the guild services, as well as others, are well attended, though there is no minister to take regular charge of the church.

Exeter, N.H., has recently celebrated its seventh anniversary; and one reports from there, "Our guild was never more flourishing than at present."

On January 5 Winchendon celebrated its third anniversary. Both the Wheeler Guild and the Junior Branch are doing well, and accomplishing "good in the town."

B. R. Bulkeley.

TEMPERANCE WORK.

We quote from the *Outlook* the following interview with John Burns by C. B. Spahr: "The greater part, and the more interesting part, of my hour's talk with John Burns was on the relation of the temperance movement to the labor movement. We had just been talking of the new attitude of the Church toward social questions; and here I found him somewhat indifferent, plainly regarding the change as more important to the Church than to the labor movement. When, however, the conversation turned to the progress of the temperance movement in the ranks of labor, he suddenly became enthusiastic, not only upon this subject itself, but on the social reform work of the churches in connection with it. Nothing could have exceeded his praise of what the Salvation Army, in particular, is doing for the spread of temperance in England. Its success in reclaiming drunkards seemed to him the most wonderful thing in recent religious history. Mr. Burns has been not only a lifelong total abstainer, but a lifelong temperance agitator; and, despite his secularism, he recognized the religious work of reclaiming lost drunkards as something beyond the scope of 'municipal statesmanship.' Nevertheless, municipal statesmanship and temperance reform seemed to him to have so many-sided a connection as to be essentially one. 'Hostility to public houses,' he said (I quote from memory), 'runs through our labor movement. Nearly every leader of the "new unionism" is a teetotaler, and among the leaders in the old unions total abstinence is gaining an altogether disproportionate hold. Even the men in the unions who drink themselves, and growl at the unsociability of those who don't, will vote nearly every time for a temperance man to conduct the business of the union. This accounts for the disproportionate teetotalism among the leaders, but temperance is spreading among the rank and file. During my boyhood, and I am hardly middle-aged, it used to be charged that this, that, or the other labor leader had been paid five ten, or even twenty pounds to change the meeting-place of the union from the "Horse and Dragon" to the "Pig and Whistle." Nowadays the owner of a "pub" would rather pay to get rid of a trade-union than to have it meet at his rooms. As a matter of fact, we are not meeting at public houses unless we can't help ourselves. Sometimes we meet in rooms belonging to churches, often in those belonging to co-operative societies, and, whenever we can, in rooms connected with town halls. Nearly every man who is prominent in the labor movement is opposed to the public houses. The one hundred and sixty-eight officers of labor unions who signed the petition last year for the Local Veto [Local Option] Bill included, practically, the whole brains and power of the labor movement. Not nearly all of them were teetotalers; but they had all got that far, at any rate. They all know that drink is the chief cause of poverty. At the same time they all believe that poverty is the chief cause of drink. Most of our labor-reform measures aim to reduce drunkenness by making healthier living possible.'"

C. R. Eliot.

LITERARY NOTES.

"George William Curtis." By Edward Cary. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.—Few of the series of "American Men of Letters" will be more welcome than the life of this typical, independent leader of reforms. For all who have been under the direct spell of the voice and presence, the eye and the manner of George William Curtis, it becomes a difficult matter to recall the man apart from his oratory, or to decide upon his relative merits as writer, orator, and political leader.

Hawthorne is said to have written to Curtis upon the publication of "Nile Notes," "I see you are forever an author"; but was it something else, some Puritan inheritance in a driving sense of duty, or was it the unhappy misfortune of that business blunder with *Putnam's Magazine*, or why was it that his genius was scattered between the demands of public service, excessive efforts in the lecture field, and the toils of an editorial chair? His very first speech of importance hints that a deep sense of duty drew him from his native and natural field of purely literary labor. It is entitled "The Duty of the American Scholar to Politics and the Times."

Ten years later he wrote: "Ah, if I could run out of this business! I do not perceive an attraction toward public life

strong enough to make the tremendous sacrifice which is necessary." This is surely the cry of the hampered genius, the literary spirit in the politician's skin.

So great was the man that, despite the excellence of his achievements, we have a regretful sense of his having left us nothing which is great enough to properly represent his genius to coming generations. Had he thrown his whole life into the public arena, who could have been a greater statesman? Had he followed strictly the literary impulse, could he have failed to carve his name indelibly between those of Lowell and Holmes? This little, rather scanty record of his life will help the public to the best conception of the noble motives that forever played within his conscience, making him through every vicissitude the apostle of righteousness.

The book is not without faults. It might be much more inspiring. Brevity seems to have been forced without gaining in vividness. There are some errors, as, on p. 334, the statement that Mr. Curtis was "vice-president of the National Unitarian Association" should be "*President* of the National Unitarian *Conference*." We notice also at least one quite unjust, as it seems to be quite uncalled for, comment upon the Unitarian faith, to which Mr. Curtis was so firmly attached, where the biographer endeavors to relieve the memory of his subject from any taint of that "narrowness and bigotry which are the peril of a belief rejecting much of what is most generally accepted." We should suggest the omission of this reflection from any future editions, as the flinging of such a taunt at the household of faith to which the subject of the sketch belonged is in itself so discourteous that we prefer to regard it as an oversight.

"Erasmus: Life and Letters." By James Anthony Froude. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1 vol.—The chief feature of this volume is, undoubtedly, the condensed extracts from the wonderful letters of Erasmus. The outline of his life, his place in scholarship, his aloofness from the stirring action of the Protestant Reformation which raged around him,—these are popularly well appreciated; but few, probably, have any idea of how graphic a description of the state of Europe during the tremendous upheavals of that period is to be found in these brilliant letters. Erasmus corresponded with members of all parties and every grade of society, including such opposite elements as Leo X. and Luther, Henry VIII. and Sir Thomas More. His view was essentially the view of the interested but unengaged on-looker; and, as a guide through the perplexing entanglements of the period, this collection of confidential utterances, so admirably collated and explained by Prof. Froude, will be found invaluable to every student of church history. The manner in which the letters are woven into the running story of Erasmus's life is perfectly natural, while the accompanying explanatory text enlightens every ordinary difficulty, and welds into solidity the abundant material. To Unitarians, of course, this brilliant outline of the career of one who was eminently the inspirer, not only of modern Biblical criticism, but of the essentially modern spirit of religious toleration, has peculiar interest. Erasmus was as opposed to Luther as he was to the errors which Luther attacked. He foresaw precisely what occurred, that dogma would meet only with more though different dogma, each calling itself the truth. What he desired was liberty for all opinion,—"a Christianity of practice, not of opinion, where, the Church no longer insisting on particular forms of belief, mankind would cease to hate and slaughter each other because they differed on points of metaphysics."

"Life of Frances Power Cobbe." By herself. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Here is a delightfully charming, entertaining record of a really noble life. The religious development of Miss Cobbe's naturally earnest, truth-loving soul is faithfully recorded through its embarrassing struggles, and forms the strongest, most inspiring part of the first volume. The outcome is a beautiful illustration of the cheering, quickening power of a natural faith. A distinct feature of the book is in the abundant reminiscences of celebrated men and women, and the charming personal anecdote and bits of humor that enliven every page. A good deal of interesting light is thrown upon Irish landlordism. Miss Cobbe acting for many years as her father's assistant in the management of his large estate of Newbridge, her views are of course conservative, and her faith in Celtic character evidently tentative. It is a book that will help a great many people in a great many ways.

"Light and Life from Above." By Solon Lauer. Boston: Lee & Shepard. pp. 250. Price, $1.50.—This is a book of rare quality and worth. It is rightly named. It is full to the brim with *life and light*, and it is truly life and light *from above*. It is long since we have read pages of deeper spiritual insight or more aglow with that joy and peace which comes from the consciousness of present immortality and the union of the human spirit with the divine.

Every page sings; every paragraph flashes sunshine; every sentence helps one feel "how beautiful it is to be alive,"—alive with the life of God. Its spirit is the spirit of Emerson, and Thoreau, and Tauler, and the writer of the Twenty-third Psalm, and the Jesus of the incomparable parables. The book is divided into five prose parts, called, respectively, "The Soul's Way of Life," "Society and the Soul," "Literature and Life," "Pages from a Catalina Journal," "Leaves from an Adirondack Journal," and one part called "Soul-voices," made up of short poems. Any one to whom the spiritual life is a reality will find this book a delight and an inspiration. J. T. S.

"The Leisure of God, and Other Studies in the Spiritual Evolution." By John Coleman Adams. Boston: Universalist Publishing House. $1.—Dr. Adams has been recognized for some years as one of the most thoughtful, edifying, and accomplished preachers in the Universalist body. This volume of fifteen sermons will fully sustain his reputation. Some of the subjects treated are: "The Inevitable Conflict," "The Line of Least Resistance," "Severity in Love," "Immortal Life and Eternal Life," "Some Things settled," "The Use and Abuse of Optimism," "The City that is to come. J. T. S.

"The Church and Secular Life." By Frederick William Hamilton. Boston: The Universalist Publishing House.—The subjects of the eight lectures which compose this candid, thoughtful, and instructive book are: "The Church and the Life of Men," "The Church and Education," "The Church and Charity," "The Church and Business," "The Church and Labor," "The Church and Politics," "The Church and Reforms," "The Church and Society." The object of the lecturer is to show that religion fails of its true mission unless it goes into all work, all thought, and all life, to purify, consecrate, and ennoble all; and an effort—we think a gratifyingly successful effort—is made to point out how this large aim of religion may be realized.

J. T. S.

SERMONS.

"Unity Pulpit."—Under this heading Rev. Minot J. Savage's sermons are published every week by Geo. H. Ellis, Boston. The latest numbers are: (13) "What can Jesus be to us To-day?" (14) "How God comes into his World," (15) "The Value of the Unknown," (16) "Happiness." Price, 5 cents each. Subscription price, $1.50 per year.

The twentieth series of Rev. John W. Chadwick's sermons, published monthly by Geo. H. Ellis, Boston, contains "A Glorious Church," "Good out of Nazareth," "The Nearer God." Price, 6 cents each or 50 cents for the series.

"A College Town Pulpit," the sermons of Rev. J. T. Sunderland of Ann Arbor, published monthly. Recent issues are: "The Soul's Cry for God," "Jesus as Humanity's Ideal," "Sectarianism," "The True Cross of Christ," "Was Jesus God?" Price, 50 cents per year, 5 cents each.

Our Japanese headquarters have issued a number of pamphlets translated by S. B. Kanda into Japanese from some of the best known of our Unitarian writers, such as Minot J. Savage's "God of Evolution," W. C. Gannett's "Life of the Bible."

NEWS FROM THE FIELD.

[*News items are solicited from all our ministers and other workers. Send them to the* EDITOR OF THE UNITARIAN, 141 FRANKLIN ST., BOSTON, *before the 18th of the month.*]

Rev. John Belden Bidwell, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of his fitness for the Unitarian ministry, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches.

W. L. CHAFFIN, *Chairman.*
D. W. MOREHOUSE, *Secretary.*

Augusta, Me.— The Unitarian society issues a neat pamphlet containing the church calendar, quotations from well-known minds, the statement of the Saratoga Conference, church covenant, and an invitation to all who are seeking a more rational basis in religion to co-operate in practical work. The pamphlet announces a series of winter sermons upon the general subject, "My Religion." Following are the list of topics: January 6, "My Religious Inheritance"; January 13, "Formation of New Ideals,—Struggle"; January 20, "Positive Step,—Freedom"; January 27, "The New Idea of Nature"; February 3, "The New Idea of Man"; February 10, "The New Idea of God"; February 17, "Change of Attitude toward the Bible"; February 24, "A Rational View of Jesus"; March 3, "Seeking a Deeper Basis of Authority"; March 10, "Prayer in the Light of Law"; March 17, "Old Idols and Modern Sanctities"; March 24, "Universal Religion: Theism and Altruism."

Aurora, Ill.— The People's Church at this place is in excellent condition, but sorrowing at present over the loss of its able and faithful pastor, Rev. J. H. Acton, D.D. who closed his labors here the last Sunday of the old year. He now goes to the Unitarian church at Seattle. Dr. Acton, who has been at Aurora eight years, has done a great and good work in laying the foundations of an intelligent faith, in character-building, and in confirming the confidence of the people in an absolutely free church.

Berkeley, Cal.— The Unitarians in Berkeley have had in contemplation ever since the organization of the society the erection of a church. At the outset they leased Unity Hall for a year, believing that at the expiration of that time a permanent building could be erected. Since then the lease of the hall has been renewed from time to time, but now a new church in the near future has been decided upon.

The site chosen by the Unitarians is the north-east corner of Bancroft Way and Dana Street. It is one of the most eligible locations in the university town. The lot is one block from the Congregational church, and bids fair to be the religious centre of Berkeley. Stiles Hall and the Young Men's Christian Association Building are also only a block distant. The plans were drawn by J. B. Mathison of this city, and were chosen from a number submitted. In architecture the church will be an adaptation of twelfth-century Lombardy. The principal feature is a campanile. The Italian style was chosen by Mr. Mathison as being particularly appropriate to the genius of California.

The Berkeley Unitarian Society will erect the church and assembly-room. The first building complete will cost $30,000; and the assembly-room, which is to be immediately commenced, will cost $10,000. When finished, there will be no partitions between the church and the assembly-room. A succession of large arches hung with curtains will separate the two, so that the seating capacity of the whole room will be about one thousand. The arrangement of the interior of the church is conventional. The organ-loft is in the rear, back of the rostrum, with plenty of space for the choir in front of the organ, and side rooms,—one for the choir, and one for the minister's study. The organ-loft of the assembly-room is over the entrance, corresponding in height to the second story Sunday-school-rooms on the end.

The floor of the church has a decided fall. Although fifty-seven feet in width, there are to be no columns or supports of any kind for the church roof, so that the view will be entirely unobstructed.

Boston, Mass.—The late Dr. George E. Ellis, who for so many years has been a familiar figure in Boston, was minister of the Unitarian church in Charlestown for thirty years. He was the author of "A Half-century of Unitarian Controversy," and contributed to Justin Winsor's "Narrative History of America." In his later years he was a devoted member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. An amusing anecdote is told of him in the *Transcript*, which shows a humorous trait which few who did not know him intimately would have expected in so dignified and serious a man: One very hot day, going to an informal dinner with a friend, he wore a very comfortable but unfashionable thin coat and manila hat. A noted and notoriously orthodox clergyman began to banter the Unitarian divine regarding that big straw hat, whereupon Dr. Ellis replied that he would not have a word said against that article of apparel, inasmuch as it had been a good friend of his for four years. "Why," exclaimed his friend, "how could it have lasted so long?" "Because it has been Calvinized," responded Dr. Ellis. The host, misunderstanding the word, inquired with amazement how the hat could be galvanized. But Dr. Ellis, with a sly twinkle in his eye, looked straight at the orthodox minister, as he replied: "I did not say 'galvanized.' I said the hat had been Calvinized,—dipped in brimstone."

—The South Congregational Church issues a Bulletin of its activities for January, from which we quote:—

"This church was incorporated on July 16, 1827, being the fifteenth Congregational church established in the town of Boston. The first church was dedicated Jan. 30, 1828; the second church, in Union Park Street, was dedicated Jan. 8, 1862. In October, 1887, the church removed to the building it now occupies. This had been built by Hollis Street Church, and the two churches then united. Hollis Street Church was founded in 1732. The South Congregational Church is a Unitarian church. No Unitarian church has any dogmatic creed; but all the Unitarian churches of America accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man."

Among the many opportunities of varied work and culture which this church offers, including a class for the study of good citizenship, we notice one which must of necessity be unique; and that is the Thursday noon meetings, when Dr. Edward Everett Hale reads the latest and best books of the day. How many thousands would like to share the inestimable privilege of this class, to listen to the interpreting voice and interpolated remarks of the only literary genius left to us of this departing century's famous group! The books thus reviewed by Dr. Hale during January were: Froude's "Life and Letters of Erasmus"; "Life of Frances Power Cobbe," by herself; "Life and Letters of Maria Edgeworth"; 'George William Curtis," by Edward Cary; Fiske's "Idea of God" and "Destiny of Man."

—At the Church of the Disciples the Alliance announces: February 12, "The Labor Movement": (1) "Why Labor complains"; (2) "Good and Evil of Labor Organizations"; (3) "What the Church should say and do." Read files of *Public Opinion* and *Lend a Hand;* Prof. Ely's "Socialism"; Edward H. Hall's "Discourses," published by George H. Ellis, p. 187; Ruskin's "Unto this Last"; Emerson's "Man the Reformer," in "Miscellanies," old edition.

February 26, "Health": (1) "Relation of Body and Mind"; (2) "Duty of being Well"; (3) "Religious Spirit conducive to Health." Read Tuke's "Influence of Mind over Body"; Hinton's "Mystery of Pain"; Call's "Power through Repose"; C. G. Ames's "Mind and Body"; James F. Clarke's "Self-culture," chap. ii.

—One of the most earnest, self-sacrificing, and devoted men in the Unitarian ministry is to leave his Boston charge for the West. We refer to Rev. W. R. Lord, under whose able leadership the Harrison Square Society has built its new stone church in Dorchester. He has accepted the call to go as successor to Rev. S. M. Crothers to St. Paul, Minn. He will be very deeply missed by all his Boston brethren in the ministry, as well as by his loving parishioners and all the many friends in the many fields where his active influence has been felt. The prospect for St. Paul is, however, exceedingly happy. They will find Mr. Lord a heart-winner as well as a pulpit preacher and a church worker

Chelsea, Mass.—Rev. Henry Powers resigned his pastorate of the First Church, which took effect Jan. 1, 1895. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Standing Committee Dec. 31, 1894:—

"We, the members of the Standing Committee of the First Unitarian Church of Chelsea, in accepting the resignation of our minister, Rev. Henry Powers, hereby testify our appreciation of the services he has rendered to our church and to our city during his fifteen months' pastorate. Therefore,—

"*Resolved*, That we wish at this time to record our sense of his ability and scholarly attainments, both of which have been at the service of all the various departments of our church activities.

"*Resolved*, That we acknowledge with pleasure that, in the active work of the Associated Charities and in the No-license campaigns, he has been a vigorous and indefatigable worker and an earnest advocate of all that makes for the best life of our city.

"*Resolved*, That we regret that the present condition of the society, and the smallness of our numbers, make it impossible for us to continue to avail ourselves of his services; but, while thus obliged to sever our relations as pastor and parish, we extend to him our cordial wishes for his success in whatever field of labor he may engage.

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions be spread upon the records of this society, and that copies be sent to the *Christian Register* and *Unitarian*."

Chicago, Ill.—On Thursday evening, January 10, All Souls' Church held its annual banquet and business meeting. Over two hundred people sat down to the attractive tables laid in the church auditorium. After an hour spent in material and social refreshment the business meeting was opened by Mr. William Kent, president of the board of trustees, with an address in which he briefly reviewed the work of the past year, and closed with words of hearty good cheer for the year to come. Then followed the reports of other officers of church and Sunday-school,—the chairmen of the different sections of church and Unity Club,—all telling of work done and burdens borne, and difficulties conquered or still to be met. These were followed by the address of the pastor, Mr. Jones. And the record of his sermons, lectures, speeches, journeys, Unity Club meetings, and business meetings of many kinds, funerals, weddings, and christenings, made people who have sometimes complained of hard work blush for the leisure hour they occasionally enjoy, and suggested that he must have found some magic way of piecing out the too short year with a web of his own weaving.

Cincinnati, Ohio.—At the Unitarian church, Reading Road, the pastor, Rev. George A. Thayer, is preaching an attractive series of sermons on "The Belief in God." The subjects for February are "An Answering God" and "The Relation of the Belief in God to Morals." Following these there is to be a series on "The Ascent of Man."

Concord, N.H.—Interesting Christmas services were held in the Unitarian church on Sunday, December 23. The church was beautifully decorated, entirely in green, small trees and large quantities of evergreen being used with most charming effect.

Rev. F. L. Phalen preached an able sermon upon "The Jesus of History." At 4 P.M. there was a special vesper service. The new "Christmas Service" was used with good effect. The choir rendered several selections, and there was a short address by the pastor. "Channing Guild" was organized on Sunday evening, January 13, by the young people of the parish. The following officers were elected: president, Rev. F. L. Phalen; vice-president, Miss Gertrude Downing; secretary, Cooledge Chase; treasurer, Harry Clough. Executive Committee: Miss Eva Sanborn, Miss Amy Comins, Miss Gertrude Lawrence, Fred Blackwood, Frank Abbott, Huse Blanchard. The list of members is not yet complete, and the exact line of work which the guild will take up is not fully decided upon; but much interest is manifested among the young people, and the prospects are good for the success of the movement.

The society loses one of its oldest and highly respected members in the death of Daniel F. Secomb, which occurred January

14. He was a consistent member of the church, and had long held the office of deacon. He was also treasurer of the Sunday-school. He was greatly interested in the work of the church and society, and gave freely of his time and means to assist in any way that he could. He was a good and true man, held in the highest esteem by all; and he will be sadly missed.

Coosada, Ala.—On Thursday evening, December 27, Dr. Thomas D. Hall passed away to his final rest. His was a long life of love and duty, of pious and cheerful obedience, exemplified in a never-failing charity that embraced all who loved our heavenly Father.

He was a noble seeker "after the truth by which no man ever yet was injured." The death of Dr. Hall is an irreparable loss to the Unitarian cause, as well as to his many friends and relatives. He was, without question, the leader of Unitarian thought in Alabama. We cannot now estimate the important work he has done. The future will prove how many of us are indebted to him for our "spiritual emancipation." He had only just begun to reap his harvest. The richest yield will be gathered by those who come after him. How better can we prove our appreciation of the loving interest he manifested in each and every one of us than by coming bravely forward to carry on the work he has just laid down?

His end was peace; and the fragrance of his memory and noble Christian example will be a treasured heritage to those near and dear to him, as well as to the community in which he lived for so many years.

J. M. W.

Ellsworth, Me.—In December the society held its annual sale and supper, and for a number of years has not realized so great an amount from its labor. One feature of the sale was the table of fancy articles made by the Sunday-school scholars, the proceeds of the sales from this table to be used to purchase books for the Sunday-school library.

Mr. Cochrane is now preaching here in the morning, and then driving to Bar Harbor to preach in the evening.

Exeter, N.H.—The pastor has recently given the first of a series of addresses to the boys of the high school. Mr. Nickerson's subject was "Reminders of English History." Other gentlemen, mostly townsmen, will follow in this course. The number of academy students interested in our church and its work is larger than for a few years past. The guild connected with this church is having now its most prosperous season. It has this year forty members. Its meetings have averaged, so far, a larger attendance than ever before. On Sunday, January 13, some of its members furnished music for a service conducted by the minister at the county jail. The guild maintains its work for the Montana mission, and proposes to plant trees this coming spring in front of the church, to replace the old elms which died last summer.

Greenfield, Mass.—All Souls' Church, the beautiful new home of the Unitarian society, was dedicated to its religious and social purposes last month with services of peculiar fitness and interest. The church stands physically, as it is hoped it will spiritually, very near the heart of the town. Its cost, by the report of the Building Committee read at the dedication by Hon. E. A. Hall, is shown to have been $27,000; and the society is but $2,000 in debt for its construction.

Hopedale and Mendon, Mass.— The evening meetings at Mendon are calling forth no little interest. Their success shows what laymen and laywomen may do, unassisted, to increase religious interest in all practical church matters. These meetings observe a devotional service, singing, and the discussion of some theme previously agreed upon. Mr. Frank French gave us at Hopedale another of his interesting talks upon "Analogies from the Watch" on the evening of December 16. On the 30th Mr. H. W. Bracken read an interesting and instructive paper on the "Norwegian and Kindred Systems," while Mr. C. P. Godfrey spoke upon "Life."

Lancaster, N.H.—Rev. A. N. Somers has been delivering a most successful course of instructive Sunday-evening lectures upon "Current Topics," such as "Workingmen and Old-age Endowments," "The Dependent and Delinquent Classes," etc. These lectures have been reported in the local papers, and stimulated thought and discussion.

Lawrence, Mass.— Our Sunday-school now has more than a hundred members. Alliance has about ninety members. Unity Club has just concluded a most successful series of evenings on "Colonial History," and is just beginning a most promising course on "American Literature." The vestry is often packed in these gatherings. The church has recently paid off a debt of $2,200. Rev. George H. Young has recently given a course of lectures on "Noted Women" in Library Hall, also lectured in the Unitarian church at Tyngsboro and at Barton Square, Salem. The ladies had a very profitable Dickens carnival last year. Next Wednesday they have a kettledrum in City Hall, with supper, drama, and dancing. A little girls' club, "Willing Workers," of upward of thirty members, is doing capitally in good times for themselves and works of helpfulness. The boys also have a "Brigade."

Leicester, Mass.—All of liberality is not found within the denomination *called* liberal. To the supper and reception recently given to its new pastor and wife by the Ladies' Society of the Trinitarian church in Leicester the invitation was cordially extended to the Ladies' Societies and pastors (with their families) of the neighboring Methodist and Unitarian churches.

The Methodist pastor could not be present. After the supper and a social half-hour the Unitarian pastor with his family was invited to stand side by side with the Trinitarian pastor and wife, and receive the kindly greetings of some two hundred people, largely Trinitarians, but including Unitarians and others. Such good will as shone upon the faces of the leading spirits of the event, who sought to share their happiness with others without regard to creed, was something to be remembered. For a Trinitarian society to give as cordial a public welcome to the pastor and family of the Unitarian church as to its own is an omen which forebodes the coming of that kingdom on earth in which all disciples shall be as one, thus fulfilling the great hope of the Master. Associated with the ministry for nearly half a century, I fail to recall any instance of fraternal hospitality between the Trinitarian and Unitarian churches proffered by either which savored so much of the true spirit of brotherly love. Let the beacon lighted on Leicester hill be caught by every hill-top, till all the valleys shine with the light which shows to every child the way to the Father!

Lowell, Mass.—One of the most complete and satisfactory church Year Books we have seen comes from the First Unitarian Church of Lowell. It is a pamphlet of forty pages, containing a full directory of the parish; a thoroughly detailed financial statement, that every one can easily understand; clear statements of membership requisites, of what the church stands for, and of nearly a score of sub-organizations within the church, besides calling attention to the denominational organizations, charities, ministry at large, etc. It is going to be hard for this flourishing church to part with their inspiring minister, Rev. George Batchelor, who has been appointed secretary of the American Unitarian Association at the annual meeting. The Year Book reports the following in regard to Mr. Batchelor's resignation:—

"While the vote passed at the annual meeting shows the society's appreciation of Rev. Mr. Batchelor, it does not in the least express their sorrow at his retirement; and, while they can but feel that he is the natural successor of Rev. Mr. Reynolds as secretary of the American Unitarian Association, yet the regret at his loss is none the less great."

Madison, Wis.—Rev. W. D. Simonds, pastor of the Unitarian church, is giving a series of Sunday evening lectures entitled "New World Leaders of Public Opinion," —the topics for this month: February 3, "Wendell Phillips"; February 10, "Theodore Parker"; February 17, Contemporary Club evening; February 24, "John G. Whittier."

Manchester, N.H.—The Unitarian society has extended a call to Rev. Charles J. Staples to become its pastor, and the call has been accepted. The society is looking forward with much interest and confidence to welcoming their new pastor, and has fresh hope of new prosperity.

McMillin, Wash.—The First Unitarian Church was dedicated December 16. The following persons took part in the exercises: Rev. F. H. Adams, Puyallup; Rev. O. L. Fowler, McMillin; Rev. W. E. Copeland, Salem, Ore.; Mr. James Shippen, Seattle; Mr. A. D. Hale, McMillin. The new church was further consecrated by the marriage of Miss Linnie Hale, daughter of Mr. A. D. Hale, and Mr. John McCollin.

Meadville, Pa.—The Meadville *Portfolio* announces that, in accordance with the provisions of the will of the late Mrs. Susan F. W. Brackett of Cambridge, Mass., the Meadville Theological School is to receive one-half of the proceeds of her estate, after the payment of legacies and the settlement of claims. It is not unlikely that the sum realized may be from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars.

A valuable gift has been made to the library by Rev. Samuel May of Leicester, Mass. It is a complete set of the publications of the Egypt Exploration Fund.

The enrolment of the Theological School has thirty-six names, distributed as follows: Seniors, 14; Middlers, 9; Juniors, 10; Specials, 3; total, 36. Five of the students are women. Sixteen of the whole number come from New England.

"The Iowa Unitarian Conference pledged itself to the extent of $50 for summer preaching next year by students. We understand this good example has been followed by other conferences. The success that attended the summer efforts by our students is highly gratifying to the cause, the only regret being that there was no greater fund available to cover a larger field of work. Such vigorous action as above, however, will obviate the want, and provide for a larger number of students for the coming summer."

Rev. W. I. Lawrance has accepted a call to become pastor of the Independent Congregational (Unitarian) church, and it is expected that he will enter upon his duties at once.

Middleboro, Mass.—Rev. W. C. Litchfield has resigned his pastorate here, to take effect March 5. The resignation is received with regret by the many friends, both

within and outside the society, which he has made since his location in town.

Philadelphia, Pa.— There was a very large attendance on Sunday at the First Unitarian Church in commemoration of that most unusual event, the seventieth anniversary of the ordination of Rev. William H. Furness, D.D., and of his installation as pastor of the First Unitarian Church.

Pittsfield, Mass.—To the great regret of not only the Unitarian society, but a much larger circle of friends, Rev. Carl G. Horst has resigned his pastorate, after three and one-half years' successful ministry.

Saco, Me.—Our people are much interested in a series of talks or lectures on "Evolution," given on Thursday evenings, at the Women's Educational and Industrial Rooms, by Mr. Marsh and Mr. P. H. Moore, pastor of the Congregational church. They are extremely interesting and instructive; and their popularity is evidenced by the attendance, people of all denominations, and from Biddeford as well as Saco, being found regularly in their seats, so testing the capacity of the place that "standing room only" could be hung at the door almost every evening. The lectures are illustrated by charts and diagrams on a blackboard as well as specimens of minerals and fossils.

Salem, Mass.— Union services at the East Church during December, and at the First Church during January, have been well attended. On the evening of January 20 Rev. E. B. Willson gave an exceedingly interesting and instructive discourse on "The Covenant of the First Church."

—The dedication of the new chapel of the East Church brought the former pastors of the church together, and a very pleasant occasion was enjoyed by all present. This service marks the beginning of a period of increased activity in the work of this ancient parish.

—A course of lectures on "Social Science" has been arranged for a class at the North Church.

—The "Alliance" of the Barton Square Church is in the midst of an active season of work. Once a month lectures on "Unitarian Biography" are given at the vestry. The pastor has spoken on "Dorothea Dix," and Rev. G. H. Young has spoken on "Louisa M. Alcott." Other lectures will be given: by Rev. W. H. Lyon, on "Mary Carpenter"; Rev. Albert Walkley, on "Theodore Parker"; and Rev. C. D. Bradlee, D.D., on "Thomas Starr King." The "Brotherhood of Christ" will have charge of the union service at the Barton Square Church February 3. Rev. F. B. Mott, who organized the "Brotherhood," and Rev. G. D. Latimer are to speak.

—Mr. William Lloyd Garrison is to speak before the Essex County Unitarian Club on Friday evening, February 1.

Salt Lake City, Utah.—The First Unitarian Society here, although one of the youngest church organizations, has steadily increased; and the year just passed has been an important one: first, on account of the resignation of Dr. Utter and the advent of Rev. Stanley M. Hunter as the pastor; and, second, the removal from the Salt Lake Theatre to Unity Hall, where the society has found a permanent home. The congregation numbers now over two hundred; and the Sunday-school has six teachers and fifty pupils, under Dr. Utter's care. The Unity Club was organized by the new rector, Mr. Hunter, and has made rapid strides. The Ladies' Unitarian Society is an executive body, and has done excellent work through the year. Mr. Hunter also conducts a class for the study of the different doctrines of the sects of America, and the meetings of this class are very interesting.

Spokane, Wash.—Rev. A. G. Wilson, minister of the Unitarian church, is doing exceptionally good work. He came to the Unitarian pulpit from the Methodist church of Spokane some four years ago, and he seems to be breaking forth with the same zeal and enthusiasm for righteousness He has not complained of the coldness or the intellectualism of the Unitarian fellowship, but has found ample field for his own warmth. Among other good ventures, Mr. Wilson has taken a down-town hall, where he holds an afternoon "People's Service," and reaches the ears of several hundred people at each service. Recently Mr. Wilson has arranged to have a sermon published semi-monthly, which are paid for by subscription or sold at five cents a copy. In this way Mr. Wilson is reaching a large constituency outside of his church.—*Parish Visitor.*

Sturgis, Mich.—Rev. G. W. Buckley of the Unitarian church of this place is just commencing a series of sermons on Jesus. The first will be on "The Gospel Biographies of Jesus"; the second, on "Jesus the Man of Intellect"; the third, on "Jesus the Man of Feeling"; the fourth, on "Jesus the Preacher"; the fifth, on "Jesus the Doer"; the sixth, on "Jesus the Messiah." The series promises to be very interesting and instructive. The liberal movement here is steadily growing, especially in the character of its membership.

Valparaiso, Ind.—Rev. T. G. Milsted of Chicago has again taken up the Unitarian work here, where there is a normal school of two or three thousand students. He preaches to his own church in Chicago in the morning, and comes out here in the afternoon, where he speaks to large audiences, made up, to a considerable extent, of students.

Waterville, Me.—The annual fair of the Unitarian society was held in December.

On the first evening a bountiful supper was served; and on the second evening the farce, "Per Telephone," was very finely presented by the Fatima Club. The net proceeds of the fair exceeded $200.

The Women's Alliance, although small in numbers, is doing good work; and under its auspices Rev. Mr. Newbert of Augusta has given his lecture, "Impressions of Concord." The evening was an unfavorable one. Consequently, the audience was small; but those who braved the elements spent a most enjoyable evening. Mrs. Beach of Bangor spoke to us on January 2 on "Sunday-school Work," and later in the season Mrs. Dix and Mrs. Davis of New York are to favor us.

The Unity Club is steadily increasing in numbers, and is a marked social feature in the society; and the Sunday-school is flourishing. Another year we hope to increase our numbers and do better work than ever.

Wollaston, Mass.—Our church has met with a terrible loss lately in the death of Mr. Sylvester Brown, who was chairman of the Parish Committee and teacher of the larger adult Bible class, in both of which capacities he will scarcely be replaced. Aside from his official duties, his strong influence for good, his magnetic power as a leader, his devotion to the young, and his unfailing cheerful kindliness of disposition make his loss an irreparable one. The society, however, is trying to learn the lesson of his life, and is doing good work.

The Sunday services, including the guild, are well attended; and the Sunday-school was never in such a flourishing condition. The Unity Club, which meets twice monthly for literary work, under the leadership of H. W. Lull, superintendent of the Quincy schools, has a large membership, and is growing in interest. The "Ladies' Aid," whose president is Mrs. F. Bishop of the Woman's Press Association, has an exceptionally good attendance, and is doing good work, not only as a financial and social support of the church, but as a stimulus to broad and intelligent thought among the women. We also have another organization lately formed, called the "Sunny Hour Club," consisting entirely of boys, who work together for charitable objects. Just before Christmas this club gave a sale of articles made almost entirely by themselves. A sum amounting to upward of $30 was realized.

WHO'S GOING TO CHURCH?

"Who's going to church?" Was it the question at the breakfast-table? Did some one interrupt you reading your morning paper? Is father going? is mother? Are the children dressed, and have they been to breakfast? Are they going?

Who's going to church? Think one moment seriously. Is that really a right sort of question to ask? Ought not going to church to be taken for granted, as we take for granted going to school, going to work, going to any duty or pleasure? Why make an exception? Why put it in the category of inconsequentials, occasionals, accidentals, as one may snatch a holiday if one can get his affairs fixed, or take an evening for a neighborly visit? Isn't it a misconception, a mistake? Isn't this instinct of worship the most beautiful, after all, in the whole constitution of man? And are not the memorials of it, in art and song and prayer and charity, the most precious of all memorials of the human family?

Why do we go to church? We go for impressions; for pure and sacred associations; for a feeling, a culture we cannot get elsewhere. We do not go wholly for doctrine, for ceremony: we go because it is beautiful to rest from the thought and care of the world. It is God's house we enter: and all the presences, all the voices, are pure and holy. Is it not best for even little children to begin with these impressions, these sacred associations, this pure atmosphere, this culture they cannot get elsewhere, these influences whose impact upon the mind, the soul, the heart, are eternal good,—to begin early?

The church is of just as much consequence in the economy of your lives as anything you can name. You do not need a newspaper one whit more than you need a sermon. It is as important that you go to church as that you rest from labor, or write your absent son or daughter a long, affectionate letter this very day. Your children need the influence of worship as much as they need the art of reading. You may think you yourselves are getting on in life just as well without the incentives and consolations of religion ministered through the church; but you cannot, and never will.

Who's going to church, then? Why everybody! Going to church should be taken for granted. No question about it need be asked, no question expected. Every one in the family is going,—every one. Going to church should be as natural as going to breakfast, as going to school, as going to work.

My counsel is, Do not ask it any more.

SAMUEL B. STEWART.

Just Published.

The Deeper Meanings.

BY

FREDERIC A. HINCKLEY.

CONTENTS:

The Cost of the Divine Spark; The Poet-sion; Looking at Life through New Eyes; Rejoice, we Conquer!

Price 50 Cents.

For sale by booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price by

GEO. H. ELLIS, Publisher,
Franklin Street, - - - Boston.

IMPORTANT WORKS BY

FRANCES POWER COBBE

The Duties of Women. A Course of Lectures. 193 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

"The profoundest, wisest, purest, noblest book in prin-e, aim, and tone yet written upon the *true position of an in society.*"

The Peak in Darien: With Some Other Inquiries touching Concerns of the Soul and ody. An Octave of Essays. 266 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

"Vigorous in thought and style. We have read the lume through from preface to 'the end,' and enjoyed it."—*Watchman.*

Darwinism in Morals, and Other Essays. 422 pages. Cloth, $2.00.

Some of the chapters: *Darwinism in Morals; Hereditary Piety; The Religion of Childhood; Prehistoric Religion; The Religions of the World; The Religions of the East; The Religion and Literature of India; Unconscious Cerebration; Dreams; The Evolution of Morals and Religion.*

Religious Duty. 311 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

In discussing *Religious Duty* this book treats comprehensively *Religious Offences, Religious Faults,* and *Religious Obligations;* the whole being designed as a "contribution toward a vast object,—the development of Theism as a Religion for the Life no less than a Philosophy for the Intellect."

The Scientific Spirit of the Age, and Other Pleas and Discussions. 243 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

Faithless World. Cloth, $1.00.

For sale by booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price by

GEO. H. ELLIS, Publisher,
141 Franklin Street, - - - Boston.

Important Works.

The Evolution of Christianity. By M. J. SAVAGE. 178 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

CONTENTS: *Old World Religion; Judaism and its Hopes; Conditions when Christianity was born; Jesus and What he attempted; The Influence of the Christ Idea; The First Church and Paul: The Problem of the Trinity; The Church of Rome; Growth away from Jesus; The Protestant Revolution; Science and the Church; Free Christianity.*

"One would seek in vain for a more enlightened application of the scientific method to the history of religion; and one can believe that, if close reasoning and rational faith could convert, Mr. Savage's words might bear a message to those who are without the churches and within. One reads with pleasure and confidence and hopefulness, and finds the end come all too quickly."—*Boston Times.*

The New Bible and its New Uses. By JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER. 286 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

CONTENTS: *Introduction: The New Bible; I. Errors in the Bible; II. What the Bible claims for Itself; III. The Bible as Authority; Appendix, Contradictions in the Gospels.*

Multitudes of people to-day, both outside and inside the churches, are aware that the New Criticism, arisen in our age, has revealed a New Bible; and what they want to know, and in the simplest, most straightforward way, is this: What changes in our attitude toward the Bible are involved; and what new and wiser uses of it are made possible and necessary by these discoveries? Mr. Crooker's present work succinctly answers this query.

Uplifts of Heart and Will. Religious Aspirations in Prose and Verse. By JAMES H. WEST, author of "The Complete Life," etc. *Second thousand, with additions.* 106 pages. Cloth, 50 cents.

"Full of a happy sense of Nature's beauty and bounty. One unceasing aspiration towards the 'Moral Ideal,' the 'Blessed Best.'"—*William C. Gannett, in Unity.*

"One is very strongly impressed with the sincerity and reality of expression. Mr. West is a devout and earnest religious writer."—*Boston Herald.*

Vexed Questions in Theology. A Series of Essays. By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. 250 pages. Cloth, $1.00.

The remarkable faculty possessed by James Freeman Clarke for presenting difficult problems in a simple way—clearing away all non-essentials, and having the heart of the subject stand out vividly and helpfully—is nowhere better seen than in the present volume. For any earnest seeker after the more reasonable thought of God, duty, life, religion, the book has very much of help.

Bird-Bolts. Studies of Every-day. By Rev. FRANCIS TIFFANY. 180 pages. Cloth, 75 cents.

Thirty-three brief, spicy sketches, reminding one of Charles Dudley Warner. "Written in a piquant, taking style, but full of deep philosophy and food for thought."—*Indianapolis News.*

Ecce Spiritus. A Statement of the Spiritual Principle of Jesus as the Law of Life. 238 pages. Cloth, $1.25.

"Nothing more remarkable has appeared since 'Ecce Homo.' It is as ingenious and original as that famous book, and far more subtle, inward, and spiritual."—*St. Louis Spectator.*

For sale by booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by

GEO. H. ELLIS, Publisher,
141 Franklin Street, - - - Boston.

The New Year Book

MESSAGES OF FAITH, HOPE, AND .. LOVE ..

Selections for Every Day in the Year from the Writings of

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE

"The sermons from which these selections are taken were written by one who during all his life abounded in hope, hope rooted in a faith in the never-failing goodness of a heavenly Father, a faith which grew only stronger and deeper in hours of sorrow and bereavement,—one in whom were realized the words of the apostle:—

Love beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things;

Love never faileth.

These words, which have brought strength and comfort to those who heard them spoken, are now sent forth as messages to others."

PRICE, $1.00

For sale by booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by

GEO. H. ELLIS, Publisher

141 Franklin Street, Boston